This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Tappan Presbyterian Association
LIBRARY.

Presented by HON. D. BETHUNE DUFFIELD.
From Library of Rev. Geo. Duffield, D.D.

Geo Duffield

Section
Vo

BS
64
.R7
M
18

Rev. Prof. Duffield
with the Editor's Compliments
Sept. 27th 1846

Joseph

MEDE'S

APOSTASY

OF THE

LATTER TIMES.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION,

BY REV. T. R. BIRKS,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
AND RECTOR OF KELSHALL, HERTS.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED FOR THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION,
BY W. H. DALTON,
28, COCKSPUR-STREET, CHARING-CROSS.
MDCCCXLV.

MACINTOSH, PRINTER,
GREAT NEW STREET, LONDON.

gift
Pappan Presb. Rec
3-28-1932

CONTENTS.

Page

INTRODUCTION..... i

THE APOSTASY OF THE LATTER TIMES.

A Treatise on 1 *Timothy, chap.* iv. *ver.* 1, 2, *&c.*

CHAP. I.—The Dependence of the Text upon the last Verse of the preceding Chapter—Why, in the Description of the Mystery of Godliness, the Words (*assumed into Glory*) are set last—Division of the Subject—The Author's three Reasons for rendering the Text differently from the common Translation. 83

CHAP. II.—Apostasy in the Scripture imports "Revolt" or "Rebellion"—That "Idolatry" is such, is proved from several passages in Scripture—By "Spirits," in the text, are meant "Doctrines"—Doctrines of Demons are to be taken passively, viz. for Doctrines concerning Demons—Several instances of the like form of speech in the Scriptures..... 89

CHAP. III.—Demons (according to the Theology of the Gentiles,) were—1. For their Nature and Degree, a middle sort of Divine Powers between the Sovereign Gods and mortal men—2. For their Office, they were supposed to be Mediators and Agents between the Celestial Gods and Men.—This proved from Plato, Plutarch, Apuleius, Celsus in Origen, and St. Austin—The Doctrine of the Mediation of Demons glanced at, and reproved by the Apostle. Coloss. ii. 8.—The distinction of Sovereign Gods and Demons proved out of the Old Testament, and elegantly alluded to in the New. 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6..... 94

CHAP. IV.—The Gentiles' Doctrine concerning the

original of the Demons, viz. that they were the Souls of Men deified, or canonized, after death—This proved out of Hesiod, Plato, Trismegist, Philo Biblius, the Translator of Sanchoniathon, Plutarch, Tully.—Baal, or Bel, or Belus, the first deified King; hence Demons are called in Scripture, Baalim—Demons and Heroes, how they differ—Demons, called by the Romans Penates, Lares, as also Dii Animales, Soul-gods—Another and a higher Kind of Demons, such as never dwelt in Bodies: these answer to Angels, as the other (viz. the Soul-demons) answer to Saints 102

CHAP. V.—The Manner and Way of worshipping the Demons and retaining their presence, viz. by consecrated Images and Pillars—That Images were as bodies for Demons to animate and dwell in—The worshipping of Images and Columns a piece of the Doctrines of Demons—This proved out of Trismegist, Porphyry, Arnobius, Minucius, Felix, &c.—The Worshipping of Demons in their Relics, Shrines, and Sepulchres, another piece of Demon Doctrine—That the Gentiles' temples were nothing but the Sepulchres of dead men—The gross idolatry of the Egyptians 110

CHAP. VI.—A Recapitulation or summary of the Doctrines of Demons—How the Severals thereof are revived and resembled in the Apostate Christian Church—That the word "Demon" is sometimes in Scripture taken according to the Theology of the Gentiles, and not always for an Evil Spirit—That it is so to be taken in the Text was the judgment of Epiphanius; an observable Passage quoted out of him to this purpose 118

CHAP. VII.—Why those words in the description of the Mystery of Godliness (*received into Glory*) are set last—That praying to Saints glorified, as Mediators and Agents for us with God, is idolatry—For the proof of this several Grounds are laid down—To be prayed to "in Heaven," to present our Devotions to God, and to deal as an Agent and Mediator

between us and Him, is a "Prerogative" appropriate to Christ, a flower of his Glory and Exaltation to sit at God's right hand, a Royalty incommunicable to any other—That none but Christ our High Priest is to be an Agent for us with God in the Heavens, was figured under the Law, in that the High Priest alone had to do in the most holy place, and there was to be Agent for the People —That though Christ in regard of his Person was capable of this God-like Glory and Royalty, yet it was the will of God that he should purchase it by suffering an unimitable Death—This proved from several testimonies of Scripture—Saint-worship is a Denial of Christ's Prerogative—Bread-worship in the Eucharist, to what kind of Idolatry it may be reduced—How Saint-worship crept into the Church 129

CHAP. VIII.—That Idolatry is the main Character of the Church's Apostasy, proved by three Arguments 147

CHAP. IX.—An Exception against the foregoing Assertion—That Antichristianism cannot be charged upon those that acknowledge the true God and Christ—The Answer to this, wherein is interwoven the Author's serious and pathetical Expostulation with the Church of Rome—That Antichrist is a Counter-Christ, and his coming a Counter-Resemblance of the Coming of Christ, shewed in several Particulars 152

CHAP. X.—The second Particular in the Description of the great Apostasy, viz. the Persons apostatizing expressed by TINEΣ, *some*—The great Apostasy was to be a general one—The word [TINEΣ, *some*] doth not always imply a few, or a small number, proved by several Passages in Scripture—The true Church of Christ was never wholly extinguished—Wherein we and the Papists differ about the Church's Visibility—In what respects our Church was visible, and in what it was invisible, under the Apostasy and Reign of Antichrist—This is further cleared by the parallel State of the Israelitish Church under the Apostasy of Israel 160

CHAP. XI.—The third Particular, or the Time of the Apostasy—That the Last Times in Scripture signify either a continuation of Time, or an end of Time—That the Last Times simply, and in general, are the Times of Christianity ; the Last Times in special and comparatively, or the Latter Times of the Last Times, are the Times of the Apostasy under Antichrist—That the Times are set out to us to be as marks to inform us when the Things to fall out in them should come to pass ; and not the Things intended for signs to know the Times by—This observation illustrated from Dan. viii. 174

CHAP. XII.—A more particular Account of the Last Times in general, and of the Latter Times of the Last Times—That the four Kingdoms of Daniel are the Great Calendar (as the LXX Weeks the Lesser Calendar) of Times—That the Times of the fourth or Last Kingdom (that is, the Roman) are the Last Times meant in Scripture—That the Latter Times of the Last Times are the Latter Times of the fourth Kingdom, wherein the Great Apostasy should prevail 181

CHAP. XIII.—Two Enquiries concerning the Latter Times—I. What Durance they are to be of—Answ. That the Times of the Antichristian State are to last Forty-two Months, or Twelve Hundred and Sixty Days—That hereby cannot be meant Three Single Years and a Half, proved by several Particulars.—Enquiry II. When they begin—Answ. That they take their beginning from the mortal Wound of the Imperial Sovereignty of Rome, or the Ruin of the Roman Empire—This proved from the Apocalypse and 2 Thess. ii., where by "that which letteth" the Fathers generally understand the Roman Empire—The same further proved from Dan. vii.—That by the little Horn is meant Antichrist or the Man of Sin (and not Antiochus Epiphanes), was the judgment of the most Ancient Fathers 185

CHAP. XIV.—That we are not to reckon the Latter Times, or the Times of the Empire's Ruin and the Apostasy attending, from the full Height thereof: this illustrated from other Computations in Scripture—The three main Degrees of the Roman Empire's Ruin—Who are those three Kings whom the little Horn (or Antichrist) is said, in Dan. vii., to have displanted or depressed, to advance himself—About what time Saint-worship began in the Church—That we are not too curiously to inquire from which of the three Degrees of the Empire's Ruin the Apostatical or Latter Times take their Beginning 194

CHAP. XV.—That Daniel's Seventy Weeks are a Lesser Calendar of Times—That in reference to these Weeks must those phrases in the Epistle to the Converted Jews, viz. "the last hour or Time," "the end of all things," "the day approaching," etc., be expounded, of the end of the Jewish State and Service at the expiry of the Seventy Weeks—That the Apostles were not so mistaken as to believe the End of the World should be in their days, proved against Baronius and other Romanists 204

CHAP. XVI.—The fourth Particular, viz. the Warrant or Proof of this Prophecy—When the Spirit speaks expressly, and when by secret instinct or inspiration—That the Spirit foretold the Great Apostasy expressly in Dan., chap. xi. 36—39—An exact Translation of these Verses—The chief Difficulties in them explained, and incidentally other places of Scripture—The different Opinions of Junius and Graserus about verse 38—The Author's Translation free from the inconveniences of both—A particular explication of "Mahoz," and "Mahuzzim:" that hereby are meant Fortresses, Bulwarks, as also Protectors, Guardians, Defenders, &c.—How fitly this Title is applicable to Angels and Saints, accounted to be such by those that worshipped them.. 213

CHAP. XVII.—A particular Explication (by way of

paraphrase) of the forementioned Prophecy in Dan. xi.—This further illustrated by several Observations, wherein the Events are represented as exactly suitable and applicable to Daniel's Prophecy—That at the Beginning of Saint-worship in the Church, Saints and their Relics were called Bulwarks, Fortresses, Walls, Towers, Guardians, Protectors, &c., according to the native Signification of the Word used by Daniel, Mahuzzim—A brief Explication of the following Verses in Daniel xi., viz. 40—43 226

PART II.

CHAP. I.—PART II.—The Author's Three Reasons for Translating the Text differently from the Common Versions—That the Preposition ('Ev) in the Text signifies *through* or *by*—Other Places of Scripture where it signifies likewise *Causam* or *Modum Actionis* 238

CHAP. II.—PART II.—The Words of the Text explained—That for the Character or Quality of the Persons that made way for, or brought in the Great Apostasy, some were Liars, some had seared consciences, some forbade Marriage and Meats; others were guilty of all these imputations—What is meant by the hypocrisy of Liars—That this appeared in three Things: 1. Lies of Miracles; 2. Fabulous Legends; 3. Counterfeit Writings under the name of Antiquity—That Lies of Miracles appeared in, 1. their Forgery; 2. Illusion; 3. Misapplication—What is meant by having seared Consciences—That the strange and indecent Tales wherewith the Legends and the like Writings are stuffed, argue those that did either vent or believe them to be men of seared (that is, hard and unfeeling) Consciences—Some Instances of the indecency of those Stories 243

CHAP. III.—PART II.—That the Worship of Saints and their Relics was brought in and promoted by the Hypocrisy of Liars, or by lying Miracles.—No mention of miracles done by the Bodies or Relics of Martyrs in the first 300 Years after Christ; nor was the mediation of Martyrs believed in the First ages of the Church—That the Gentiles' Idolatry of Demons was advanced by lying Miracles, proved out of Eusebius, Tertullian, and Chrysostom 250

CHAP. IV.—PART. II.—That Saint-worship was advanced by fabulous legends, this proved from the acknowledged design of the Latin legends, as also of that Greek legender, Simeon Metaphrastes; particularly his fabulous narrations concerning Anastasia, S. Barbara, S. Blasius, S. Catharine, S. Margaret, &c. 258

CHAP. V.—PART II.—An useful digression concerning the time when Simeon Metaphrastes lived, and the occasion of his writing. That his living within the time of the great opposition against Saint-worship moved him to devise such Stories as made for the credit and advantage of that Cause then in danger—A brief Historical Account (even out of the Records left by the Adversaries) of the great Opposition in the Greek and Eastern Churches against worshipping of Images and of Saints: when it began, how long it lasted, and under what Emperors—Of the great Council held at Constantinople under Constantinus Copronymus against Idolatry—An attempt to foist in Two Canons in favour of Saint-worship frustrated—Several Slanders and Calumnies fastened upon the Council and the Emperor by the Idolatrous Faction—The original of these Slanders: that they were notorious Lies, proved from the Decrees of the Council 266

CHAP. VI.—PART II.—That Saint-worship was promoted by Counterfeit Writings under the name of Antiquity—that Image-worship and the Idolatry of the Mass-God were advanced by the Hypocrisy

of Liars—This illustrated from several Fabulous Narrations—A foul Story made use of by the Second Council of Nice in the behalf of Image-worship 278

CHAP. VII.—PART II.—That by these two Characters (forbidding Marriage, and commanding to abstain from Meats) are chiefly deciphered Monks and Friars—That Prohibition of Marriage and abstaining from Meats are inseparable Characters of Monastic Profession—That the Renouncing of Possessions or the having no propriety in anything (another principle in Monkery) may be included under the abstaining from Meats—That the word (βρωματα) translated Meats, implies all things needful for maintenance of Life, proved from several places of Scripture 282

CHAP. VIII.—PART II.—The Monastic Life and Saint-worship began much about the same time—That Monks and Friars (chiefly intended in the Text by the words "forbidding to marry," &c.) were the main Authors and Advancers of Saint-worship, proved from the Testimonies of Chemnitius, St. Austin, Gregory of Tours, as also Eunapius, a Gentile writer—That Monks and Friars were the Ringleaders and chief Advancers of Image-worship, appears in that (during the Iconomachical Controversy in the East) the greatest part of the Storm fell upon those of the Monastic Profession—That the Idolatry of the Mass-God was promoted by the same persons 287

POSTSCRIPT 297
NOTES 321

INTRODUCTION.

THE name of Mede has long stood deservedly high among the interpreters of prophecy and champions of the Protestant faith. Besides his solid piety and evident honesty in the pursuit of truth, his writings are marked by acute sagacity, various and discursive reading, and a close research into the Word of God. These excellencies are all conspicuous in the following treatise, on the Apostasy of the Latter Times. It bears marks, indeed, of that rough and unfinished style, which he owns as a fault in one of his letters; but for close and varied research, happily applied to illustrate an important warning of Scripture, few works can claim equal praise. No treatise, perhaps, has had a more powerful and lasting effect in unmasking the Christian idolatries of former ages, and thus forming a strong bulwark against the proud pretensions of the Roman Antichrist.

The work seems doubly seasonable at the present moment. Writers in our own Church are busy in the effort "to purge away the filth and scum" of Romish legends, and to pour them

by Lives of the Saints, in a filtered and sentimental form, on the sacred fountains of youthful thought. It is well, therefore, that the warning of the Spirit against the "hypocrisy of legend-mongers" should be explained from history, and sounded loudly in the ears of the Church. Thus, with God's blessing, many souls may be rescued from the subtle delusion, who might else be fatally bewitched with these pleasing love-potions and sorceries of Rome. The enemy may for the last time come in like a flood: but, in these prophetic warnings, the Spirit of the Lord will lift up a mighty standard against him.

A treatise of such a kind, so weighty for its learning, and so decisive in its tone, cannot fail to have suffered rude onsets from the open friends, or unconscious favourers, of Romish corruptions. Its critical exactness, its history, its theology, have all been more or less assailed. The learned Bishop Pearson entered early into the lists, and in the following reign devoted a Latin sermon to the task of refuting the exposition. Others, of late, have revived his objections, and have slightly increased their number, or varied their form. Even one zealous Protestant divine has rejected his version, and transferred the date of the predicted Apostasy from the opening of the fifth century to the time of the council of Trent. But the chief rival expositions are those which refer the text to heretics of the second century, or to some Infidel delusion, still future. The first is the view of Bishop Pearson, as of Dr. Burton, and many others; the second has found

several advocates among living writers. But, in both alike, all reference is denied in it to the middle ages of the Church, and those practices which our own Reformers denounced, as "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

Having accepted the office of introducing the work to the Christian public, in a popular form, it seems a duty to enter fully into these objections; wherever they are true, to admit their truth; and wherever false, to expose their error, and correct the statements of the author. This will occupy one section; and though I shall strive to be simple, may be passed over, if needful, by the more unlearned reader. I shall then proceed, in the second place, to confirm the exposition by reason, by analogy, and the whole of the inspired context; and then to unfold some of the spiritual and practical lessons which flow plainly from this solemn warning. These parts of the introduction will be adapted, I trust, to strengthen the faith, and quicken the zeal, even of those readers who may have no pretensions to critical learning.

SECT. I. The words of the original text are the following:—

Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις, καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, Ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, Κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνώκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

Of these, Mede offers the following version, and on its substantial truth his exposition is made to rest.

"Howbeit the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in

the latter times some shall revolt from the faith, attending to erroneous spirits, and doctrines of demons; through the hypocrisy of liars, having seared consciences; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." Or otherwise, "through the hypocrisy of liars; of those who have their conscience seared; of those who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving, of them that believe and know the truth."

The following translation, in my opinion, is still more exact, and precisely gives the force of the original.

"But the Spirit saith expressly, that in after times some will revolt from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons; through the hypocrisy of liars, (*or* legend-mongers,) seared as with hot iron in their own conscience; that forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and have known the truth."

Now here several questions arise of a critical nature, which must be examined in order, before any exact exposition can be safely raised on the text..

1. Is Mede correct in the construction he assigns to the second verse, where the genitives, *liars, seared, forbidding,* are made to depend in common on the word, *hypocrisy?*

The authorized version, as Mede observes, is clearly wrong. The three genitives of the

second verse cannot agree with the *some* of the former verse. This would certainly be a solecism "not sampled elsewhere in St. Paul's writings," and may be rejected without hesitation.

The simplest construction, in grammar merely, would refer the genitives to the word *demons* just before. But the sense decidedly forbids this reference. For whether the word *demons* here signifies *devils*, or the deified souls of the dead, the apostle would never have described them as speaking lies in *hypocrisy*, or as having seared consciences. These epithets plainly belong to living men. This rendering must therefore be set aside equally with the former.

A third construction has been proposed, in which the genitives are viewed as *partitives*, depending on the word *some* in the first verse. The meaning will thus be,—"Of those who speak lies in hypocrisy, *some* will in latter times depart from the faith." But there are three reasons which forbid this construction also. Partitives are never found separated so far from the word on which they depend; and they always, except in the case of pronouns, require the article to attend them. Besides, those who have seared consciences must, all of them, and not some only, have previously departed from the faith of Christ.

Thus we appear shut up to the construction offered by Mede, in contrast to all those above. And indeed the author who has of late departed most widely from Mede's application of the text, still assents to the truth of his version in this

point. The use of the preposition, *ἐν*, in a causal sense, is frequent in the sacred writings. The objection, also, that in this case a passive and not a middle verb would be required, is totally unfounded, for all the three voices occur alike in such a construction, as might easily be shown. The emphatic expression, *their own conscience*, which Mede has overlooked, is a further proof that the liars of the second verse are distinct persons from the apostates of the first; and thus confirms the view of Mede, and disproves the partitive construction.

There is only one other translation which seems possible; but as I have not seen it suggested by any one, I name it with some diffidence, though it differs but slightly from that of Mede in form, and still less in meaning, and would only confirm his view of the reference of the word *demons*. The genitives, then, ver. 2, may depend in common on *spirits* and *doctrines*, as genitives of the *agent*, though not agreeing with *demons*, which might be a genitive of the *object* governed by the same noun. This double genitive, though rather harsh, has many examples in classic authors. The version will thus become, "Giving heed to seducing spirits, and devilish (*or* demonolatrous) doctrines, of men that speak lies in hypocrisy, and are seared as with hot iron in their own conscience." The words, *ἐν ὑποκρίσει*, will thus belong exclusively to *ψευδολόγων*, with which they seem naturally connected; and the parties in the second verse will be expressly the teachers, in contrast to the disciples of error. But perhaps

the harshness of the double genitive may render the view of Mede preferable. Thus, however obscure the syntax, the only two constructions that seem lawful concur almost precisely in the same meaning.

2. This leads to a second inquiry. Does the word *doctrine* admit a genitive of the *object*, or thing taught, or does it require one of the *agent?* Mede adopts the former view; Bishop Pearson strongly asserts the latter. The *doctrine of baptisms*, Heb. vi. 2, is the first instance which Mede has adduced. The Bishop objects to the rendering; and urges that, even if it were correct, the instance is irrelevant, for baptisms are not persons, and a genitive of a person invariably denotes the agent or teacher, and not the subject of the teaching.

The objection, in this case, is just and solid. The true rendering of the phrase in Hebrews is, *baptisms of instruction;* that is, either, as the Bishop supposes, baptisms for which catechumens were trained by previous teaching; or else, rather, baptisms that instruct us as lively emblems of the inward cleansing of the soul. But there are two of Mede's examples, Acts xiii. 12, Tit. ii. 10, which the Bishop passes in silence. In proof of the opposite construction, he quotes Acts ii. 42, 2 Tim. iii. 10, Rev. ii. 14, 15; and then condemns the construction of Mede in the summary words,—"In vain this usage is sought for in the Scriptures, assuredly it can nowhere be found."

In this contrast of opinions let us appeal at once, by a full induction, to the Word of God.

Two words rendered, *doctrine*, occur, διδαχη and διδασκαλια, the latter being used in this passage. The first occurs *seven*, the second *four* times, with a personal genitive; besides *ten* examples of one, and *two* of the other, with pronouns. In the latter cases, with one exception, the genitive denotes the teacher. The same is true in five of the former passages, Matt. xvi. 12; Acts ii. 42; Rev. ii. 14, 15; Col. ii. 22; and it is therefore the most usual construction.

But it is not universal. In Rom. xv. 4, the possessive pronoun, which is equivalent to a genitive, relates to *the persons taught*, and not to the teacher. This is distinct alike from both the *agent* and the *object*. In the five other texts, omitting the one in dispute, Acts xiii, 12; 2 John 9, *bis;* 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 12; the use is ambiguous, but seems to include both ideas alike, the object, and the agent. Nay, on a closer view, the object is more prominently intended. In Acts xiii. the *doctrine of the Lord* may denote that of which He is the author. But the simplest reference is to the previous words—*Now, behold the hand of the Lord is upon thee.* It was a doctrine concerning the Lord, as the powerful Avenger of open blasphemy, and its rapid confirmation, which smote the conscience of the deputy, and brought him to the faith.

In the second epistle of St John, the *doctrine of Christ* may also denote that of which Christ is the author. But the context points to the other meaning. "Many deceivers," it is said, "have entered into the world, who confess not Jesus Christ coming in the flesh." Then the words

follow, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son." On comparing 1 John iv. 2, 3; v. 1; it is still plainer that the Apostle intends chiefly by that phrase, a doctrine *concerning* Christ, in His person, His incarnation, and His future return.

The same remarks apply to 1 Tim. vi. 1, and Titus ii. 10, especially the latter. The title itself, *God our Saviour*, points at once to the object of the doctrine, salvation, and not to the means by which the truth is conveyed to us. And the context confirms this view; for it is a brief summary of Christian doctrine, closing with *the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*

The personal genitive, therefore, refers in one instance to the persons taught, and neither to the teacher nor the doctrine. More usually, and when applied to living men, or our Lord himself upon earth, it refers to the person of the teacher. But where God or Christ are thus mentioned, though both ideas are perhaps included, the idea of the *subject* of the teaching is more prominent, in every case, than that of its *author.*

To which class of texts does the present one bear the closest analogy? Clearly to the last. The *doctrines of demons*, however explained, are in plain contrast with the *doctrine of God*, or the *great mystery of godliness*, in the same epistle. We are thus led to a view intermediate to those

of Mede and Pearson, but nearer to the former. The *doctrines of demons* will be those of which demons are both the authors and the main subject; but the subject of the teaching will be the idea chiefly designed. This is confirmed by the use of similar terms. *Faith* and *love*, when applied to living men, denote the affections which those men feel towards others, as "the faith of God's elect." But when *the faith of Christ*, or the *love of God* occurs, the phrases denote commonly the faith and love of which they are the objects. (Compare Rom. iii. 22, 26; Gal. ii. 16, 20; iii. 22; Phil. iii. 9; Col. ii. 12; James ii. 1; Rev. xiv. 12; Luke xi. 42; John v. 42; Rom. xv. 30; 2 Cor. v. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 5; 1 John ii. 15; iii. 17, v. 3.)

The second point then, like the former, must be decided in Mede's favour; though his view should perhaps be slightly modified, and may thus be restored into full harmony with the construction of the early Fathers, and of many later divines. *Doctrines of demons*, are those of which demons are the *authors*, and of which they are also the *objects*; but the latter idea, if analogy has weight, must be the more prominent in the text, as it is also in Mede's interpretation.

3. Another difficulty, and the chief one, still remains. May the word, *demons*, in Scripture, be explained with Mede, in its classical sense, for the souls of the dead, or mediating spirits between God and men; or must it be taken strictly for devils, or fallen angels? The latter is vehemently maintained by Bishop Pearson, who calls

the view of Mede "abhorrent from Scripture, novel, and quite unheard of in the Church of God, sustained by no text of Scripture, and no testimony of the ancient Fathers."

Four passages had been adduced by Mede, who insists chiefly on the two first:—the words of the Athenian philosophers (Acts xvii. 18.); the expression of St. Paul in his reply, verse 22, "in all things ye are too superstitious," (*δεισιδαιμονεστέρους,*) or, as Mede expounds it, "too full of *demons* already;" the words of the same apostle, 1 Cor. x., where *the cup of demons* alludes, in his view, to a proverbial usage of the Greeks; and the prophecy of St. John, Rev. ix. 20. Besides these, he refers to the phrase of St. Luke iv. 32, who, on the first use of the term, adds the epithet *unclean*, to mark it off from its popular to its sacred sense; and also the testimony of Epiphanius on the passage before us.

The reply of Pearson, on the first passage, must be owned to be complete. The use of the term by heathens is no proof of its usage by the Holy Spirit. "The sacred page," he observes, "does not call Barnabas, Jupiter, or Paul, Mercury, because it tells us that the heathen addressed them by those names."

In the second text, Acts xvii. 22, which Mede joins with the first as one of the strongest, he is also clearly in error. The term, *δεισιδαιμονια*, may be used classically, as its derivation implies, for the worship of *demons* in contrast to the sovereign Gods. But here the apostle plainly employs it, as our translators thought, in the sense of *super-*

stitious. For how does St. Paul prove his charge? Not by altars or offerings to any demons, but by the altar to the unknown God, whom he expounds himself to be really the true and sovereign God of heaven and earth. Clearly, in his view, it was the dark and blinded character of their worship, not its being addressed to mediating powers, or demi-gods, which proved his charge against them.

So far the objections are valid. But a close and full search will still clear our author from the reproach of unscriptural assumptions; and shew, more plainly than he has done himself, the warrant which the word of God supplies for his exposition.

Let us first lay down the truths in which all agree. It is certain that the word, in its classic use, denotes a class of demigods, or deified souls of men, supposed to mediate between the sovereign God and mortals upon earth. It is no less certain that in the Septuagint and the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels, it is generally used to denote wicked spirits, or fallen angels. It is confessed by both alike that the demon worship of the heathen, paid in their own view to good spirits, or deified heroes, was really, in God's sight and the language of Scripture, paid to wicked spirits, or devils. Finally, it is agreed, in the passage before us, that devils are the real instigators of these corrupt doctrines, whether they be, or be not, in some sense, their objects also.

These maxims being admitted, a view the same

in substance with that of Mede, but unfolded more distinctly, may be safely and boldly maintained. Doctrines of demons, in the fullest sense of the word, will be those of which *demons* are the authors, it is true, but of which they are also the objects; *really*, in the sight of God, and in the phraseology of the Holy Spirit, who reveals spiritual things in their true light; but *unconsciously, and deceptively*, in the view of deluded apostates, to whom, as in the heathen worship, they successfully personate the deified souls of the dead, or good spirits and angels of light.

This view is commended to us, first, because it gives the fullest meaning to the phrase; and in a prophecy so brief and so emphatic no other plan of interpretation can be just. The genitive, as Scripture analogy has shewn, must include the *object* still more conspicuously than the *agent*. A doctrine of delusion, expressly so termed, and of which demons are the objects, in their Scripture sense, must be a doctrine of demons, in the popular or classic sense of the term, which the Scriptures, while they do not adopt it, clearly recognise in the words of the Athenian philosophers. This first reason alone is a strong presumption for Mede's exposition of the passage.

The view is confirmed, next, in the strongest manner, by Rev. ix. 20. For none on the wide scale have ever worshipped devils, as devils; while the worship of devils *unconsciously*, as demons or middle powers, was the essence of heathen idolatry. And hence,

naturally, the doctrine of demons will denote devil worship, not known as such by the worshippers, but viewed as such by the Spirit of God. And next, specially, the passage clearly relates, from the scope of the whole, to nominal Christians, and must therefore be the same worship to which Mede has applied the present text. To bring the argument still closer, the passage demonstrably relates to the times of the Turkish triumphs in the East; and therefore refers to those very corruptions whose enormous height brought on the blessed Reformation; that mercy of God, which too many, as swine do pearls, are now ready to trample under their feet, and to turn again and rend its consistent and faithful children. To say then, with the Bishop, "non aliter Johannes in Apocalypsi," is a rash assertion, contradicted on a closer view. The Spirit there yields the strongest confirmation of that precise view of the passage, which Mede has so fully and ably unfolded.

A third proof may be drawn even from the passage in Corinthians, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. Mede had suggested that "*the cup of demons*," refers to "the cup of the good demon," a proverbial phrase in the feasts and sacrificial rites of the Greeks. The Bishop rejoins that it is certain St. Paul followed here the sense of Scripture, of Moses and the prophets. For we read the very words (Deut. xxxii. 17), *They sacrificed to devils, not to God*, and so also in Baruch. And that the apostle referred to the words of Moses is most certain, for he adds, "Do we provoke the Lord

to jealousy?" alluding still to Deut. xxxii. 21. Also the *table of devils*, is an express allusion to Isaiah lxv. 11, where the Septuagint reads, "preparing a table for the devil, (τῷ δαιμονίῳ,) and filling a drink-offering to Fortune." And he concludes, with a slight sarcasm in his tone, "I expound St. Paul by Moses, David, Isaiah, Baruch, the gospels, James, and John, rather than by Plato or Plutarch."

But this triumph of the learned writer is premature. His remarks on the allusion to Moses and Isaiah are doubtless just and accurate; but his inference is faulty, and the suggestion of Mede may be just as true as his own. It is natural that the inspired apostle, a Jew familiar from his youth with Moses and the prophets, should allude to their statements. It is equally natural that, when writing to Greeks of Corinth, many of whom might never have read the Old Testament, but who were all familiar with heathen feasts, he should allude to their own rites and proverbial phrases. The very subject on which he is writing suggests this idea, for it is advice about heathen feasts in idol temples, or where sacrifices were used and eaten. The argument itself almost requires such an allusion. For the Apostle has to prove that the actual sacrifices at Corinth were offered to devils. The actual use of the term, *demon*, by themselves in their proverbial phrase at their feasts, and by the Scripture as a term of devil worship, is just the link on which the strength of it depends, as an appeal to their conscience. His reasoning is thus clear and forcible. The Scrip-

ture declares, he tells them, that what the heathen used to sacrifice, was to demons or devils, not to God. You know yourselves that the cup set apart at your feasts is called the "cup of a demon;" and, therefore, your table also must be the table of a demon; and under that very name, Moses, and the prophet of God, Isaiah, have condemned your heathen worship, as a worship of devils, not of God. The passage thus combines two scriptural with one classical allusion, in order to fix the charge of devil worship on the seemly and beautiful forms of Gentile superstition.

There are several further proofs which strengthen greatly our previous conclusion. For, first, the word διαβολος (*devil*), which elsewhere in Scripture is always used for Satan himself, is in this epistle, and that to Titus, used three times in its purely classic sense of a slanderer or accuser. So that, even if this passage stood alone, the argument against the classic sense of the word *demon* would be convicted of rashness by an instance so curiously parallel to it in the same epistle. And next, if the word were taken here merely for the agents, it would be a pure tautology. For all seducing spirits are devils, and all devils are seducing spirits. The second clause would thus add nothing whatever to the lesson of the former, and the words, *doctrines of devils*, would leave the sense just as complete if they were removed from the text.

There is one further argument, which I have reserved to the last, because it seems to have been overlooked both by Mede and his oppo-

nents, and yet is, in my opinion, one of the most convincing and decisive. Purely spiritual forms of evils are, in Scripture, always referred to Satan. On the other hand, *demon*, though the word denotes an evil spirit, is never used for those spirits unless as the objects of idol worship, or else as possessing the bodies, and thus personating the voices and the character of men. Thus, in Deut. xxxii. 17, the Septuagint for the first time uses the term, "They sacrificed to devils, and not to God." The same phrase recurs Psalm cvi. 17, and still in connexion with idol worship. So also in Psalm xcvi. 5, where the version of the Seventy runs thus: "All the Gods of the nations are devils." The same use occurs in Isaiah lxv. 11, where the same version renders the terms, "that prepare a table for the demon" (τῷ δαιμονίῳ), and the connexion with idolatrous sacrifices, is equally evident. These appear to be all the instances of its use in the Septuagint, with one single exception, Ps. xc. 6, where it is a plain mistranslation. The Hebrew term in the third passage is constantly translated elsewhere, *idols*, or *graven images*, and the two other Hebrew words occur nowhere beside.

The same law of usage is universal in the New Testament. There are fifty-two instances of its occurrence in the Gospels, and in every case it relates manifestly to the possession of a human body, and the visible personation of a human voice and character. The properties and characters of the spirits were to be known only through the persons of those who were

possessed. Thus, "he was casting out a demon, and it was dumb; and when the demon was cast out, the dumb spake." Again, in the blasphemous charge against our Lord, the reply is made, "Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?" And hence, when the Seventy bring their joyful report that "the demons are subject" to them, our Lord changes the term when a purely spiritual event is to be described, and says, "I beheld *Satan* as lightning fall from heaven."

In the Acts the word occurs only once, and there it is used by the Athenians in its strictly classic sense, for lower objects of worship. In St. Paul's Epistles it appears four times, besides this passage in Timothy, and always in connexion with idolatrous sacrifices of which demons are the objects. Once also by St. John, in Revelation, for the last time, and there equally as the objects of worship—"that they should not worship demons." So also the kindred term δαιμων in Matt. viii. 31, Mark v. 12, Luke viii. 29, conforms to the same law.

The exceptions, even in appearance, are two only, one for each term. The first is James ii. 19: "The devils also believe, and tremble." But the words are most naturally explained of the exorcism of evil spirits, then practised in the Churches, and the similar works of our Lord himself recorded in the gospels. The cries of the demons, the violent rending before they departed from their victims, their prayers not to be sent into the deep, answer exactly to the Apostle's phrase; and the appeal to those whom

he addresses, most of whom had probably witnessed such exorcisms, is more vivid when his words are explained in this manner.

The other is Rev. xvi. 14: "they are the spirits of demons, working miracles." But this confirms the rule, rather than presents a real exception. For, the dragon and the beast are expressly named as objects of worship, and the same is implied of the false prophet. The *spirits of demons* will still denote spiritual agents that prompt to idolatrous worship, and actively promote its revival, as *demons* will denote spiritual powers of evil to whom such worship is consciously or unconsciously rendered.

The argument, therefore, brought with so much triumph against the exposition of Mede, upon a full induction of Scripture becomes entirely reversed. A slight change only, little more than verbal, is needed, to make his interpretation accord with the universal law of Scriptural language, while the rival exposition varies from that law just as widely. *Doctrines of demons*, if the word of God be our guide, are doubtless doctrines in which evil spirits are busy and active, but in which they are busy, either as the instigators and secret objects of idolatrous worship, or as personating the form and character, and speaking, so to speak, under the name, of human beings. In the classic acceptation of the term which Mede adopts, both of these ideas are combined. We have only to fill up his interpretation with the solemn truth that, here as elsewhere, evil spirits are the secret agents and

true receivers of the forbidden worship, though rendered under human or angelic names far differing from theirs; and we have a view in harmony, the only view which is really in harmony, with the uniform language of the Spirit of God.

One further test remains, by which to confirm and seal all the previous arguments. There is, in the New Testament, one actual example given us in the history of the Church of a seducing spirit. We find it in the narrative of St. Paul at Philippi. And what in this case was the character of the demon-doctrine? It combined three elements, and of these, two were elements of truth, and one of error. The voice of the seducing spirit was Christian in its first sound. "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which shew unto us the way of salvation." Here was the supremacy of the true and only God, and the apostolic commission, distinctly and fully proclaimed. But it was also "a spirit of Python;" one whose design and habitual teaching was to raise the reputation of the Delphic god, and promote the worship of Apollo. If this example of Scripture have any weight, we see clearly the view to which it leads of the seducing spirits and doctrines of demons in the latter times. These spirits might proclaim and enforce the doctrine of one true and Most High God, and of an apostolic commission in the Church of Christ; but with them they would blend the idolatrous worship of lower powers, of mediating and inferior spirits, like Apollo among the Gentiles, as more easy of access to the ears

and wants of mortals. Such is exactly the mournful picture which history has unfolded, and which the Spirit of God, in this one short phrase of St. Paul, has so vividly portrayed.

The censure, then, pronounced upon Mede, as "tam infeliciter Scripturas interpretatus," may be exactly reversed. The infelicity is theirs who reject an exposition in harmony with the whole usage of Scripture, and adopt one for which no warrant can be found. For the word *demons* is never once applied to evil spirits, as the promoters of abstract heresy or of purely spiritual forms of wickedness. It is always connected with idolatrous worship, or the personation of human beings.

One Father, Epiphanius, is quoted by Mede as giving a suffrage in favour of his view. The Bishop, however, citing the first words of the passage, as Mede has done the last, affirms that Mede brings his witness "mutilated, and imperfect, and wretchedly explained;" and that Epiphanius, like all the others, is express for the Bishop's own construction. But the learned writer here speaks like an opponent in the schools, and not as an impartial judge. Let us examine the whole passage. Epiphanius is writing against the Collyridians, who made the Virgin a goddess, and these are his words:—

Ὥστε εἶναι τὸ πᾶν διαβολικὸν ἐνέργημα, καὶ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου διδασκαλίαν· πληροῦται γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ, ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς ὑγιοῦς διδασκαλίας, προσέχοντες μύθοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων. Ἔσονται γάρ, φησὶ, νεκροῖς λατρεύοντες, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ *ἐσεβάσθησαν· καὶ ἡ τῶν ἁγίων κατὰ καιρὸν εἰς Θεὸν δόξα ἄλλοις γέγονε τοῖς μὴ ὁρῶσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν εἰς πλάνην.*

The following is an exact version :—

"So that the whole is a diabolical influence, and a doctrine of an unclean spirit; for in these also is fulfilled the saying, Some shall depart from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of demons. For they shall be, he says, worshippers of the dead, as they were reverenced in Israel also; and the glory of the saints in their time before God has been to others who see not the truth a cause of delusion."

The whole passage, fairly alleged, is decisive in Mede's favour, and it is strange how Bishop Pearson could overlook the fact. Epiphanius is distinct that the passage contains two things—the *agents*, and the *subject*, of the false doctrine. The apostates were to give heed to *seducing spirits*. Hence he calls the heresy "a diabolical influence, and a doctrine of an unclean spirit." The apostates were to give heed to *doctrines of demons*. Epiphanius is no less positive that the apostle, in those words, asserts that they would be worshippers of the dead, as they were worshipped in Israel. And no wonder; for the word *demon* occurs four times in the Septuagint, and three times in connexion with the idolatrous worship, not of the heathen, but of Israel. The learned but partial writer might well say that "the rest of the passage in Epiphanius was obscure," when he had first shut his eyes resolutely against its evident meaning, and this a meaning confirmed by the whole analogy of the Word of God.

4. The view of Mede, on the three chief

points in debate, is now justified and confirmed from the internal evidence of the text. One or two minor questions still remain.

First, does the term ῥητῶς, *expressly*, denote, as he explains it, "in the express words of some former Scripture?" And is the passage in Daniel xi. rightly applied to the same apostasy as the present text?

On the former point I incline to think that Mede is in error. The word ῥητον in contrast to ἀρρητον does not seem to denote a *written* in contrast to a *spoken* saying; but one distinct or express, in contrast to one ambiguous and obscure. Again, the word *saith* implies a present message, and not one given at a distant time, which would require ειρηκε, *hath said*. Hence the words seem to describe the actual prophecy, as revealed at the time by the Holy Spirit to the Apostle. There may, however, be an allusion to a former voice of the Spirit, in which the same truth was taught more obscurely, and thus the comparison with Daniel may still be substantially correct.

The other question is of greater importance, and many Protestant writers, of late, have renounced Mede's exposition, and refer the Wilful King, and the worship of Mahuzzim, to some past or future form of Infidel rebellion. This is not the place to enter on so large an inquiry. But though once a convert to their views, I feel now persuaded that, here also, the sound and cautious judgment of Mede has not deserted him, and that his exposition of the text in Daniel, in all its leading features, is accurate and true. But to give

the reasons for this opinion would require a treatise of itself; and the chapters where Mede treats of it are quite separable from the main argument of his work, however they may place its evidence in a clearer and fuller light.

5. Is Mede correct also in expounding the *latter times* to denote the *time, times, and half a time* of Daniel's prophecy, chap. vii.? Here, I conceive, a slight correction is needed to his statement. The phrase in the text, being without the article, is more accurately rendered, *in after times*, and therefore is less definite in its own nature than Mede appears to assume. But it is equally plain, on the other hand, that it is not the same with *the last times* in their wider sense, or the Christian dispensation; for these *after times* were future when the Apostle wrote. A comparison with 2 Tim. iii. 1, throws a further light on the meaning. We may gather, from the contrast between καιροὶ (*seasons*), and ἡμέραι (*days*), that these after-times were of long continuance; and from the like contrast between the epithets ὑστέροι and ἔσχαται, that they were not the last times of all in the Christian dispensation. The natural conclusion is, that they refer to the middle ages of the Church—a long season of demonolatrous apostasy, to intervene between the Apostle and the selfish lawlessness at the coming of the Lord. They will thus mainly answer to the period in Daniel, though not strictly confined to the times of the manifested little horn.

One slight correction remains, and may close this inquiry into the critical and exact meaning

of the text. In the second part, Mede has taken the genitives *distributively*, as if they referred to distinct classes. But this appears forbidden by the construction of the Greek phrase. The participles, having no article, must be closely joined to the noun, *liars*, on which they depend, and describe different features of one and the same class of men. Still it may be very true that in some instances one feature would be more prominent, in others, a second, and a third in others. Good and holy men might also partake of the infection in one form, and escape the rest. And this is all that is needed to reconcile the facts of history with the inspired prophecy.

From this whole review it appears that the criticism of Mede, in all its leading features, remains firm and unshaken. The corrections that have really to be made are slight in themselves, and do not affect the substance of his interpretation. After all the objections which learned adversaries have raised, his exposition remains as superior to theirs in critical exactness, as in dignity, fulness, historical interest, and moral power.

Sect. II. The internal soundness of Mede's exposition, has now, I trust, been clearly proved, and the objections raised against it, in all its main features, are shewn to recoil on the rival theories. It is time to enter on a wider field, and one of more interest to general readers; the further proofs to be gained from reason and Scripture analogy; and the harmony of the truth with all the deeper instincts of a purified and spiritual imagination. At present there are two mighty

influences leagued against Protestant truth. Neology fights against it with specious abstract criticisms, or reasonings; and Catholic superstition, amidst its own sentimental fancies, rejects it with bitter scorn. There are some who, in sacred criticism, confound names with things; and think that a few learned phrases, borrowed from the Germans, give them a right to despise the sound and solid thought of elder divines as antiquated and worthless. Follies, and even heresies, become sacred in their eyes, when they are embalmed in the long winding sheet of "hermeneutical canons," the "usus loquendi," and "biblical exegesis." But there are others in whom the infection has a more specious form. The definite warnings of prophecy, in their hands, are diluted into vague presentiments of the triumph of good over evil; and they can thus look down on expositions like this of Mede, as by-gone follies, and tokens of the absence of deep and philosophic thought. Others, again, delight to lose themselves amidst the gorgeous architecture of the middle ages, the dreams of chivalry, and legends of monks, and saints, and holy virgins, and thus to nurse a mysterious and sentimental devotion. The stubborn witness of God's Spirit against Christian idolatry is then rejected with scorn and loathing. It is deemed the fruit of Protestant heresy, the mark of a narrow soul, which has no eye to discern the mysteries, and no ear to drink in the noble harmonies, of Catholic tradition.

It will be my object, in the rest of this Intro-

duction, to meet and expose these two evils. Reason and analogy, and the lessons of the whole inspired context, will first be brought to illustrate the prophecy, to silence the cavils of a superficial philosophy, and reveal the true nature of the warning in the clearest and fullest light. And lastly, I shall seek, if possible, to strip the idols of the visible Church of the deceitful hues which a spurious sentiment has thrown over them, and to open a glimpse of that wider and nobler field, which these warnings themselves, taken in their true and Protestant sense, open as an endless vista before the renewed imagination.

And first, let us inquire what view of this and similar warnings is most in harmony with the lessons of the spiritual reason. Is it that which refers them to a shortlived heresy of the second century alone? Or that which sees in them a grotesque form of infidelity in a few short years still to come? Or, finally, the view of our author, which refers them to wide-wasting evils, through every region of Christendom, and for more than twelve hundred years of the Church's history? Such an abstract inquiry needs to be pursued with caution. But the presumption of shallow theories may render it needful to meet them on their own ground; and if we enter on the inquiry in a reverent spirit, there is firm and safe footing, and we shall be able to reach a certain and well-founded conclusion.

Have we reason, first of all, to expect on abstract grounds that wide-spread evils would prevail in the visible Church, assuming that it

was to continue for eighteen hundred years? The answer is plain. The whole history of the world is one ceaseless conflict of good and evil. The Gospel came to supply a Divine remedy for enormous and abounding sin. But that Gospel itself declares that the triumph over evil will not be until the coming of the Lord, and a solemn judgment and separation. It even reveals a powerful enemy who is ever at work to deceive, and prevailing unbelief in the latest hour of the Church's pilgrimage. At its first rise, the heathen world was covered with gross darkness; and at its close, God will have concluded all in unbelief, that he may have mercy upon all. The Gospel does not profess to set aside the laws of moral influence, or the reality of conflict, though it arms the truth with a new and Divine power. It is only at the last that the tares and wheat are separated; and, of those who are within the net, the good are gathered into vessels, and the bad cast away. We must choose, therefore, between two theories. On the first view, the Gospel completely triumphs and prevails for many centuries, except in small offshoots that break off from the main body of the Church. But, just before the end, there is a sudden and total lapse from the long triumph of truth to an almost entire extinction, and a short-lived triumph of evil, no less unaccountable than awful. On the second view, the evil has worked uniformly and mightily from the rise of the faith; first, as a mystery of iniquity, and then as foul and open corruption, infecting and leavening

the great mass of the Church. Sometimes it may hide itself a little deeper; sometimes appear with more unblushing face, in open profligacy and heresy; sometimes there may be a partial revival of truth, at others a new relapse; but the evil throughout is massive, deep, and strong, till the apostasy completes itself in open warfare against the true followers of the Lamb.

The former view must be maintained by those who confine all such warnings as the present, to the two first centuries, or to days still future. How shocking, they exclaim, to suppose the visible Church at large, the object of this prediction, and chargeable through long ages with idolatrous corruptions of the faith; that holy mother from whose pale, as they fondly assert, all idols are by a Divine promise utterly abolished!

But this view, on every ground of pure reason, is most unnatural, and even absurd. It would imply that the powers of evil act only by short and fitful spasms, and at other times are buried in almost total slumber. It changes the fixed and eternal laws of moral good and evil, their awful energy, their unceasing conflict, their steady and unfailing power until the final victory, into a blind lottery, where no law can be traced, and where the humble heart finds no response to its own experience. It annuls the force of the exhortation to watch always, by proclaiming the immunity of the Church, or at least of its teachers and guides, for long ages, from all dangerous errors. It uproots all confidence in the stedfast course of Providence towards the final

victory of truth, by so full and fatal a relapse after so complete and long-continued a triumph. And hence the spiritual reason must reject it at once, as a crude notion, bred in the dark caverns of a wayward fancy, and which can never endure the clear daylight of Divine truth. The mystery of godliness, from its very rise, had to struggle with a world's hatred; and the mystery of iniquity, as its dark shadow, rose at once into being. From the very first the Gospel has put forth a mighty energy, to Christianize and redeem an ungodly world; and from the very first that ungodly world has wrought with a fatal energy within the Church itself, to heathenize and pervert the Gospel.

It is certain, then, from the plainest maxims of Scripture, that as the Church was to continue near two thousand years at least, before the resurrection, the greater part of the time would be marked by sin and evil abounding within her pale. Else, from the very nature of her spiritual life, she would rapidly have overspread the earth, still abiding in her purity, and the regeneration of the world, ages since, would have been complete.

In the next place, since these wide-spread evils would certainly exist, and as certainly be foreseen, is it reasonable and likely that warnings of them would be given to the Church? And if warnings have been given, which of two expositions, supposing them equally consistent with its terms, is to be preferred—one which confines them to some corner of the Church, to some local heresy soon extinguished, and a few years of time; or

one which refers them to the wide and lasting evils which were also sure to prevail? The answer admits of no doubt. If God had not told us the motives and design of his revelations, it might be presumption to explore them. But He has declared their purpose; and now the real presumption is theirs who feign ignorance of what is expressly revealed; and on this plea would contract the warnings of prophecy into some corner of time. All Scripture is given to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." Of these objects, two, and perhaps three, relate to the detection of error in the Church, and the recovery of those whom it has deceived. The prophecies of coming evil in the Epistles must then have been given for this end; and are adapted in the highest and fullest degree for its attainment. They must hence refer to those errors which were foreseen as the most subtle and dangerous, the widest in their spread, and the most lasting in their continuance. We must admit an inference so plain, or commit open suicide on spiritual reason. Words that fully describe an evil which has lasted for twelve centuries, will not suffer themselves to be confined to heresies of half a century, or even of a few years. Reason, with the torch of Divine truth in her hand, will detect at once the folly of such a view, and condemns it without mercy. For, in this respect, as in others, "no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation;" but claims to

be applied as largely as the strict meaning of its words will possibly allow.

But there are many who may shrink from this line of inquiry as too hazardous. Like birds of a feeble pinion, they fear to soar upward, and to dwell in the light of spiritual reason alone, however clear. And indeed we may soon be lost, and grow dizzy, when we venture too far by such guidance. But here there is no danger; the lessons of reason are confirmed by a humbler, but perhaps a safer guide. Scripture analogy, and that of the firmest and simplest kind, leads to exactly the same view.

The Church of Christ has now lasted eighteen hundred years, since the Holy Spirit was first poured out from above. The Jewish nation, from the birth of the patriarchs to its fall, continued almost exactly for the same time. Each has been separated in its turn to be the peculiar people of God. To each the promises and the covenants have been given, sacraments of grace, and means of salvation. The revelation of truth, doubtless, in the case of the Jews, was not so full as to the Christian Church, and their privileges were less exalted. But, on the other hand, their separation from the world was more complete, and a much narrower field was brought under spiritual culture. Thus the relative balance of good and evil was the same; for in the visible Church the truth revealed is more powerful for good, but the evil also has a far wider range, as the numbers of Christendom exceed those of

Israel. The analogy is therefore complete, and the experience of the Jewish nation, as St. Paul expressly teaches, is a type and virtual prophecy of the history of the Christian Church.

What then was the history of Israel, and what the nature of the prophetic warnings they received? Were they free from all open corruptions, except in some solitary tribe, or for a few years before the last fall of Jerusalem? The exact reverse is true. Even at the first return from Canaan, idols had entered. "Now, therefore, put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments." In Egypt they defiled themselves with the idols of the Egyptians. At the foot of the mount, "they made a calf, and worshipped the molten image." During the forty years in the wilderness, "they took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of the god Remphan, images which they made to worship them." Their history under the Judges is made up of relapses into the various forms of Gentile idolatry, and a whole tribe became apostate from God. Under Samuel the charge had to be renewed—"Put away the strange gods and Ashtaroth from among you, and prepare your hearts to the Lord, and serve him only." From Solomon, and his altars to Moloch and Ashtaroth, down to Manasseh and Zedekiah, the evil continued, with few and short intervals of repentance and reformation. Ten tribes were carried away captive for their stubborn idol-worship, and the two that were spared persevered in it still.

Nay, even after the fall of the temple, there was a stout and stubborn resolution of the surviving remnant, to burn incense and make cakes to THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN. After the return of Judah,—for Israel remained captive and idolatrous as before,—the evil appeared anew, and, under Antiochus, the great body joined in heathen rites and idolatrous worship once more. Afterwards, though open idolatry ceased in Judea, other evils as fearful prevailed, till they crucified the Son of God, and resisted and blasphemed the truth to their own destruction.

And this analogy is directly applied by the Holy Spirit, to explain to us the history of the Christian Church. "All these things happened unto them for types, and are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." The words of Epiphanius, which the Bishop through prejudice accounted so obscure, are both clear in themselves, and the keynote of a deep and weighty truth. "They shall be, the Apostle declares, worshippers of dead men; even as they were reverenced in Israel also." The idolatries of Israel, through near seventeen centuries, are a solemn warning of similar idolatry to prevail afterwards in the Christian Church.

And what, in this case, was the nature of the prophetic warnings? They extended through all the ages of corruption, and met the idolatry of the people, from age to age, with perpetual rebukes of holiness. Jacob was a reformer to his own household; Moses and Levi, to Israel at the foot of the Mount. The Moloch worship of

the desert was met and resisted by a distinct command. (Lev. xx.) The idolatries in the land of Canaan were predicted in the wilderness, with the severe curse which they would ensure. (Deut. vi. 14; vii. 4, 5; viii. 19, 20; xxix. 25—28; xxxi. 16—21.) Repeated protests were made under the judges against this perpetual sin; and under Samuel and the later prophets they are renewed with greater fulness and vehemence of Divine anger. As long as the evil continued, and the corruptions of the national worship, so long the solemn warning and protest went forth against them; and never ceased till, being rejected, judgment came on the people without remedy. There were also, in many cases, special warnings of special evils, which particular forms of idolatry would bring on. Thus was Solomon warned of the rending of the kingdom; Jeroboam, of the extinction of his house, and the destruction of idols by Josiah; Ahab, of his own death, and that of Jezebel; and Manasseh and the whole nation, of the destruction of the holy temple. Finally, Moses from the first had announced their sins in after days, and idolatry as the chief of them, with its bitter result in the heavy strokes of Divine vengeance.

The conclusion from this analogy, which the Holy Spirit himself holds up for our instruction, (1 Cor. x.), is plain and decisive. The visible Church of Christ, we may be sure, like the people of Israel, would corrupt themselves in the latter days. The nature of the most stubborn and lasting corruption, the parallel renders it almost as clear, would be idolatry, joining other

gods, or other mediators with the true God, and the only Mediator of God and man, Christ Jesus. The main evils of the Church, we may infer without any doubt, would be the subject of express warning, and the sword of the Spirit with its sharp and keen edge be aimed against them. No parallel can be more close or more decisive. Unless the laws of moral conflict are reversed, and the maxims of Divine wisdom suddenly turned backward which guided the whole course of the earlier revelations, we may be certain that the warnings of the epistles, and also of Daniel and St. John, do relate to a great and long-lasting idolatry that was to overspread for age after age the visible Churches of Christ.

It was of old an aggravation in the guilt of Judah, that even after the sin and punishment of Israel for her idol-worship, she treacherously returned to the same, and rivalled and exceeded her sister's guilt. But the priests and people were no less blind and stubborn in refusing themselves to own the exact parallel. "Yet thou sayest, because I am innocent, surely his anger shall turn from me." "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these." And deeper still, and more mournful and wretched, is the delusion which refuses to own, in the idolatry of Christendom for long ages, the exact and predicted resemblance of the sin both of Judah and Israel. But if Christians, like the Jews, are stubbornly resolved to do worship to "the Queen of Heaven," neither the warnings of inspired prophets, nor judgments already begun, will turn them from their fatal purpose.

The delusion will only be ended by that fire, which will utterly burn and destroy the proud walls of Babylon.

To reject, then, as many have lately done, the Protestant view of this and similar warnings, is to quench the light which God himself has kindled for our guidance in the history of Israel for more than a thousand years. When Elisha would quicken the dead body of the child, he applied mouth to mouth, and limb to limb. The contact with the holy prophet was the means of healing and life. So if the human history of the Christian Church is to become a source of real instruction, the sacred history of the Jews, its exact parallel, must be applied to it in every part, and then the whole will be quickened into a living body of spiritual truth. But if this be neglected, proclaim as loudly as we may the benefits of ecclesiastical history, it must remain a dead, and will soon become a putrid corpse; and there will then issue from it a deadly plague of self-righteousness and idolatrous formality, to infect the living generation of the Church.

This general analogy, in the history of the Old Testament, ought alone to silence the vain cavils of those who extol catholic consent, and who palliate Christian saint-worship to sustain the reputation of their idol. There was a catholic consent, under Ahab, for the worship of Baal, and under Manasseh, for that of the host of heaven. The innocent blood which the Lord would not pardon, with which Jerusalem was then filled, was doubtless the blood of those faithful witnesses

who preferred the law of Jehovah to the catholic consent of apostate rebels, and were condemned to death for their crime by some Jewish inquisition.

We might now turn to the evidence which the other Epistles of St. Paul afford us, to illustrate the extent and true reference of the apostasy here described. The warnings they offer all of them agree in this main feature, that the mystery of iniquity was already begun, and was to unfold itself more and more *within* the Church, till the final separation. For instance, the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii., whatever view we adopt, clearly fills up the *whole* time of the dispensation with three events; the mystery of iniquity, already busily at work; the apostasy, still future; and the open revelation of the Man of Sin. The warning is catholic in its range; every age of the Church is alike included, however various the dates which any may assign to the two later stages of the evil. But I have dwelt briefly on this subject in another place, and it would detain us too long to unfold it here with a greater fulness of detailed exposition.

There is, however, another class of proofs, to confirm the view of Mede in the following work, too weighty and full of interest to be passed over, especially since it has never been unfolded as it deserves. I mean that evidence which results from the character of the whole Epistle, and from the context in which the prophecy occurs. I will endeavour to unfold this very concisely, as it forms a solid and firm keystone to the whole arch of internal and external evidence.

The two Epistles to Timothy and the one to Titus, are the only inspired writings addressed to *teachers* of the Church. They are also probably the very latest of St. Paul's writings, and on both accounts we might expect to meet in them with the fullest warnings against coming evils. Two such warnings occur, 1 Tim. iv., and 2 Tim. iii., very distinct in their features. The first relates to the *latter times*, the second to *the last days*. The first refers to ascetic restraints, which God has not commanded; the other to a state of unbridled and sensual profligacy. The natural conclusion is that the former relates to the long centuries of Papal superstition, the latter to the more short-lived and open forms of Infidel apostasy. The two warnings, joined with the actual working of the mystery of iniquity, would thus be a brief, but still a complete outline, of the future evils to which the Church was exposed. The description of the time, and the main feature of the prophecy in each case, is thus exactly maintained, and each warning is in harmony with the tone of the Epistle in which it appears. Here is one weighty presumption, already, that Mede has expounded the prediction in its true meaning.

But when we return to the Epistle itself, other proofs appear. The first opening of it contains a solemn direction to Timothy to meet and resist evils that were threatening the Church. And what was their nature? "Neither to give heed to fables (προσεχειν μυθοις), and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying

in faith." The phrases here (ετεροδιδασκαλειν, προσεχειν μυθοις) are almost precisely the same as in the fourth chapter. And what are the leading evils here exposed and denounced? Fabulous legends and religious genealogies. Surely these are two plain confirmations of Mede's application of the prophecy. It was by legends (μυθοι) of saints, and hermits, and virgins, that the saint-worship of the fifth and following centuries rose to its height. It is by legends of the saints that it is sought to be revived in our own day. And the keystone of that system which has held the visible Church in bondage to a doctrine of demons, is composed of ecclesiastical genealogies. The watchword of Papal delusion has ever been the unbroken genealogy of the bishops, from the apostles downward, and especially of the successors of St. Peter, the patriarchs of the first see, and bishops of Rome.

The phrase is often referred to the Gnostic genealogies of Eons. But these were blasphemous, and would not surely have met the light censure "which minister questions rather than godly edifying." The whole context shows that the words refer to Jewish genealogies, which, from the very law of the legal priesthood, were regarded by the Jews with such deep interest. At that time they were hurtful, simply because they ministered endless doubts, and distracted the thoughts from weightier matters. But when they assumed a Christian form, and were viewed, in their new aspect of a canonical succession, as the very essence of the Christian Church, they became a

deadly heresy, the keystone of the Papal apostasy of the latter times.

The next main evil exposed is the vain desire to be teachers of the Jewish law, and the neglect of love, of faith unfeigned, and a good conscience. The expression here also, "swerving from faith unfeigned," answers closely to the words in chap. iv. 1,—"Some shall depart from the faith." Of what nature, then, was the present departure, the earnest of that deeper apostasy to come? It was vain jangling, zeal for legal ordinances, and confident assertions (*περι τινων διαβεβαιουνται*) of their necessity for salvation. Now this, also, is no feature of Gnostic heresies, or of open infidelity. But it is the very pattern of that apostasy of saint-worship which Mede unfolds in this work. Self-righteousness, legal exactions, a gorgeous ritual, and pilgrimages copied from the Jewish feasts, grew up side by side with the adoration of the Virgin and the saints, of relics and images. The keynote which the Spirit has struck already in the opening verses, thus resounds anew, and with deeper power, in the apostasy of demon-worship as explained above.

In the second chapter another main doctrine of the faith is stated with peculiar solemnity, as the motive for earnest prayer and intercession. "For there is one God, one also is the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." This clearly is one main part of that faith from which the Spirit declares expressly that some shall revolt in the latter times. What, then, should we naturally

infer to be the nature of that revolt, but the worship of other objects beside the one God, and the use of other mediators besides the one true Mediator, Christ Jesus? Such exactly are the *doctrines of demons*, as unfolded in this treatise; a view confirmed by the usage of Scripture, by the type of Israel, and by the mournful facts of history through many ages. The Virgin has expelled the true Mediator, and saints and angels have been addressed instead of the Holy One of God, the Angel of the covenant. Surely this open contrast, the relation between the faith and the apostasy which denies it, is a further proof that the warning, chapter iv., is rightly applied to the saint-worship and the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome.

The apostle next enjoins an ordinance of holy worship. "I will, therefore, that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath or doubting." The spirit of the command is clearly to magnify the moral elements of prayer, and to pass by the ceremonial. The state of the heart in holiness, meekness, and the confidence of faith, is the object to be held in view; the place was to be of little moment. "I will that they pray in every place." Here again, one main element in the apostasy of the latter times, as applied by our author, has been the abrogation of this Divine ordinance. To overlook the state of the heart, but to urge the merit of prayer in consecrated places; to introduce the shadowy holiness of the temple into the Christian houses of prayer; and to extol the merit of prayer before such an image, at such a shrine,

or before the mother Church of St. Peter, at Rome; these have been some of the main arts by which that apostasy has ensnared its victims, and reared its Babel of ecclesiastical pride. And hence we have another token that this system of pilgrim worship, at relics and shrines of the saints, is truly pointed out to us in the inspired warning.

The qualifications for the Christian ministry are almost the next subject of the apostle's teaching. And here, as we approach the prophecy itself, the allusion is perhaps still plainer. Four times, in this short description of presbyters and deacons, there is a permission, and almost more than a permission, that they may be married men. It is not simply that a passing epithet implying their marriage is given in each case. But in each instance the character is repeated, so as to form almost a leading element of their meetness for the office. (vv. 5, 12.) Their wise government of their own children was to be their best preparation for the rule of the Church of God.

Now let us turn to the next chapter, and the contrast is striking. Of the leaders in the apostasy two marks are given, and one of these is in the words—"forbidding to marry" (κωλυοντων γαμειν). It is not said forbidding marriage (κωλυοντων γαμους, *or* το γαμειν), but with a plain ellipsis of the word τινας *(some)* "forbidding *certain* to marry." What class the Holy Spirit, by the apostle, intended to mark out as the objects of the prohibition, is not hard to discover. To Christians, generally, the apostle had before, in many cases, given the

advice, if unmarried, so to continue. To two classes, however, he has, in the previous chapter, given opposite advice; to the deacons of the Church in express terms, and to the bishops, or presbyters, by a clear implication.

The teaching most flatly opposed to that of the apostle is not one which should forbid marriage generally, which neither do the words imply; but one which forbids it specially to those classes to whom the Spirit of God had just before specially commended it by his mouth. And what could so punctually fulfil this character as the Decretals of Calixtus and Innocent, the statute laws of the Roman apostasy?

"*We entirely interdict priests, deacons*, sub-deacons, and monks, from contracting marriages; *we decide also that*, according to the sacred canons, *the marriages contracted by persons of this kind be dissolved, and the persons brought to do penance.*" "We desire that those who, in the order of *sub-deacon and upward, have married wives*, or had concubines, *be deprived of ecclesiastical benefice.* For since they ought to be the temple and vessels of the Lord, it is unworthy that they should serve uncleanness."

"Let the wicked blush, and clearly understand that *by the judgment of the Holy Spirit* they who are in sacred orders, *presbyters, deacons*, and sub-deacons, *unless they cast away their wives . . . . must be excluded from every step of dignity.*"

The contrast between the apostolic and the apostate doctrine is here not less remarkable in the minor details than in the main ordinances.

The advice of the Holy Spirit—"one that ruleth his own house well, having children in subjection" —"let the deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well"—is given only to *bishops* or *presbyters*, and *deacons*. And it is met by a special decree—"we entirely interdict *priests and deacons*, from contracting marriages. *Presbyters and deacons*, unless they *cast away* their wives, &c." The Spirit assigns as one reason of this charge to Timothy, "that thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house (*or* temple) of God, which is the Church of the living God." The apostasy borrows this very reason, to give the lie to the Holy Ghost. "For since they ought to be the *temple* of the Lord, it is unworthy that they should serve uncleanness." The Holy Spirit had expressly permitted marriage to the presbyters and deacons, and "speaketh expressly" that to forbid their marriage is a mark of apostasy. The Decretal affirms that, *by the judgment of the Holy Spirit*, presbyters and deacons must cast away their wives. The holy apostle had assigned as a reason of his advice—"let the deacons be the husband of one wife, &c.,"—"for they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree." The Decretal enjoins—unless they cast away their wives, "*they must be excluded from every degree of ecclesiastical dignity.*" Can any contrast be more full and complete? Once compare the clause "forbidding to marry" with the previous chapter, and its meaning starts out to view in full relief; and the truth of the Protestant application

is thus written, as with a sunbeam, on the public ordinances of the Roman Church.

The justice of Mede's exposition may also be confirmed by the previous account of the mystery of godliness. He has dwelt himself on the order of the clause, *received into glory;* and his explanation is striking, and throws a clear light on the succeeding prophecy. But the whole description is scarcely less illustrative of the same truth. It is one of the few passages where the Godhead of Christ is directly revealed in express terms; or rather where the word GOD, is directly used for that purpose. The contrast between our Lord himself, and all the saints and angels who share in his human glory or angelic office, is thus placed in its clearest light. It is this one title that excludes at once all others from sharing in the honour due to God only, and which He will not give unto another. And thus the one doctrine according to godliness, with its one object, *God manifest in the flesh*, is opposed to the manifold *doctrines* of many *demons* or mediating powers; ostensibly and in shew, martyrs or good angels; but since these reject the worship, saying, See that ye do it not, it terminates, in the view of God's Spirit, on its secret instigators and true objects, the wicked spirits who built up similar idolatries in the heathen world. The choice of the term, "*God* manifest in the flesh—received into glory," —as well as the place of the last clause, reflects a fuller light, by contrast, on this dark apostasy to idol worship in the latter times of the Church.

The whole context, therefore, and scope of the

Epistle, confirms the exposition of Mede, and stamps it still more deeply with the solemn impress of truth. There is one further confirmation, less palpable, but which reveals itself on a closer view. The main features of doctrine in the first Epistle are free grace, diffusive love, and Divine bounty. The features of the apostasy here portrayed are the exact reverse, will-worship, forced celibacy, and ascetic restrictions. The main aspect of truth, in the Second Epistle, is holiness, Divine sovereignty, the stern exposure of evil, and the willing sacrifice of the martyr. The evil there warned of is still the reverse, and its main character is the lawless indulgence of self-will and sensual lust. There is thus, in both, an unity of plan and a completeness of outline. Now this unity and completeness are retained only when we refer the passage in 1 Tim. iv., to the superstition of the middle ages, and the other to the infidelity of later days, though earnests of both might be arising, even then, in the visible Churches of Christ.

Section III. Let us now carry the inquiry a step further, and consider the harmony of the truth, already established, with the great doctrines of the faith, and the instincts, hopes, and aspirations, of the spiritual mind. When a school of sentiment is rife, prone to sacrifice truth itself to beauty of architecture, or the reverent admiration of antiquity and legendary dreams of the imagination, a work like this of Mede's cannot fail to be most unwelcome. Even if true, it must be owned that truth presents itself in a very

plain garb, and in a stern and almost repulsive form. But truth, even in her worst attire, is far more honourable than falsehood in its most graceful form, and when clothed with all the hues of the rainbow. It may, therefore, be no useless task to unfold, briefly, the harmony of the views in this treatise with the glory of the Catholic faith, the lessons of sound philosophy, and the noblest instincts of the renewed imagination.

It has become usual of late to decry Protestantism as a mere negation, a cold and lifeless rejection of mysteries too beautiful to be altogether untrue. Some have even defamed it as the mother heresy of all heresies, and as resting solely on a proud assertion of private judgment, the inlet of all error and the very badge of Antichrist. So senseless may clever men be made by a spirit of delusion, that while every sentence they write is an exercise, and often a most reckless exercise, of private judgment, they can still brand it as the worst of heresies. Their own tongue makes them to fall, and brings them under the apostle's own description of a heretic, that he is self-condemned. Private judgment is not only lawful, but in its very nature unavoidable, unless the man and the Christian were annihilated and lost in the federal unity of the Church. The only question to a reasonable mind relates to the best and wisest safeguards for its healthy exercise. But still the protest against dangerous errors may assume too negative a form. The noblest minds may thus be repelled from it; and while they crave for some fuller exhibition of truth, may be in

danger once more of embracing rejected falsehoods, if these can attire themselves in some faint semblance of spiritual beauty.

Now the true remedy for this danger is to exhibit the needful protest against evil in its positive form, as an integral part of Divine revelation. True Protestantism is, in fact, neither more nor less than the Divine and heavenly aspect of the history of the Church. It is thus at once a corollary from the great doctrines of the Catholic faith, and a key to the philosophy of all history; while it is also the sure earnest of hopes infinitely brighter than all the visions that fancy can ever revive, with her most toilsome efforts, from the dim retrospect of ages of superstition.

Catholic truth, in the only right and lawful sense of the words, is the same with the *mystery of godliness* of which the Apostle has spoken just before. It denotes those main doctrines which are the catholic or universal inheritance of the faithful ever since the Incarnation of our Lord. Its truths all centre in His person, and consist of the various stages in that wonderful conflict of good and evil, which the Captain of our salvation waged in his own person against sin and death and the powers of darkness, till his full victory in the resurrection, and his ascension into the highest heaven. Here is an object of faith truly catholic and universal,—the joy of angels, and the blessedness of the people of God. In the presence of this catholic truth the dreams of superstition, or the trifles of ritual observance which sometimes usurp the name, shrink into

contemptible folly: and the legends and endless genealogies of a formal Church fade into thin air and are forgotten. That the living God, by whom the stars were made, and the hosts of mighty angels called into being, should have been incarnate in our world, and suffered on the cross for our salvation, is a message as universal in its range, as it is unspeakable in its Divine majesty. Even the needful rules of Church order lose all their brightness, like stars in the day-time, wherever the sunlight of this everlasting Gospel dawns in its true glory upon the soul.

But this catholic truth, so godlike and glorious in its own nature, still includes in it a protest against evil. It was a conflict and a victory that sealed our redemption. All the sins of the world, past, present, and future, formed that mighty burden which was laid on the Son of God; and when He condemned sin in the flesh, every form of evil was therein sentenced, and doomed to perpetual ruin. The wisdom of the world was sentenced and proved to be foolishness; its strength was shewn to be weakness; its religion a foul superstition; its moral virtue a thin disguise that concealed a heart of deep ungodliness. From the life, the death, and the resurrection of "God manifest in the flesh," a protest went forth against every form of human sin; a protest that can never cease till all idols are utterly abolished, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed for ever.

But the apostle has no sooner announced this wonderful mystery of godliness than the Spirit

leads him to reveal expressly a great apostasy from the faith in the latter times. The message is linked with the two last clauses of the previous description. The object of faith was Christ, the true God, received into the incommunicable glory, the sole Mediator, and, with his Father, the true and only object of Divine worship. This mystery, in itself so heavenly, was also believed on in the world. But the world and heavenly truth are apt soon to part company; and hence a foul apostasy would creep in, and a cloud of demon powers "darken the throne of the Almighty." The fact thus revealed is the true and scriptural basis of the Protestant faith. For the protest against separate errors and corruptions, however sustainable on its own grounds, is here summed up in one grand and central doctrine, no less positive and real than the mystery of godliness out of which it flows. The contrast of the two doctrines, in the aspect of the visible Church which they reveal, is real and important. But when we rise higher, and view them in their relation to the Son of God and his eternal counsels, their harmony is not less real and true. The conflict of good and evil which first revealed itself, in its highest form, in the person of our Lord, was to be renewed and continued in the history of the Gospel. Truth and error were once more to struggle and contend; and only by suffering and martyrdom was truth in the Church, as in the person of her Lord, to gain its final victory. The theorem is in the life of the Saviour; the corollary appears in the history

of His followers. One reveals to us that glorious conflict and triumph of Divine goodness, in the person of the Holy One of God, of which the visible Church is the appointed witness, and which forms the Catholic faith. The other sets forth the like conflict in the unholy children of men, of whom the Church itself is composed; till the faithful and protesting witnesses for Christ shall have their number complete, and the remainder of Christ's sufferings shall have been fulfilled in the experience of His chosen people.

Seen in this light, the Protestant faith is only a riper and fuller form of belief in the Gospel. He who has drunk deepest from the waters of salvation, in the mystery of godliness, will recoil with shuddering from the error which turns the visible Church into an idol for our blind worship. He will see in it rather the battle-field of a long conflict, where the light and truth of God have been struggling under the oppression of the powers of darkness. Every step of advance in spiritual discernment will loosen his attachment to the outward forms, while it strengthens his grasp on those inward truths they were designed to convey. In the Epistles of St. John we have a pattern of this law of spiritual experience. The aged apostle, survivor of all the rest, and mature in heavenly wisdom, is made the messenger of no fresh external ordinances, and of no allusion to forms already in being. Standing on the confines of heaven, it is the heavenly truth itself, and not the earthen vessel of ordinances, human or Divine, that attract his gaze,

and which he unfolds to the churches. Neither baptism, nor the supper of the Lord, nor rules of outward worship, much less church architecture and robes of service, altars, or chancels, or crosses, form the subject of his message; but light and love, faith and holiness, the anointing of the Spirit, and the eternal life which is treasured in Christ for His people. Such a ripening faith in the mystery of godliness, when it turns to gaze on the annals of the Church, cannot fail to discover in it a dark mystery of idolatrous corruption; and all the light it gathers from the history of the Old Testament and from the prophecies of the New, serves only to expand into practical and Protestant fidelity those deep instincts of the spiritual life, which the Catholic faith itself has awakened in the soul.

But this view of the prophetic warnings is not only the natural result of the Catholic faith, received in its true and living power over the heart; it is also the only true philosophy of history, the secret key to the mysterious providence of God. The changes of the world for the last eighteen hundred years are so great and various, the panorama is so diversified with strange and wonderful events, that serious and thoughtful men cannot fail to dwell upon them with intense and lively interest. There will, and must be, many attempts by philosophic minds, to decipher the hieroglyphics and read the inscription. There never, perhaps, was an age when this yearning after an historical philosophy was so deep and powerful as it is now. But without some first

principles to guide us, and some main outline already provided, these attempts will fail. The complexity of events is so great, the mystery of God's counsels lies so deep, and the hindrances to a full and perfect judgment are so various, that those who start, relying simply on their own wisdom, will soon be lost and confounded in so wide a desert. The general maxims of Divine truth are not enough to guide us in such an inquiry. Some further light is needful; or prejudice will taint our deductions, obscure the very maxims on which we rely, and darken our eyes to the true meaning of the events under our view. We shall oscillate, probably, between a servile adulation of primitive antiquity, and a passive adoption of the prejudices of our own day; and in either case the true philosophy of history must be veiled from our eyes.

A simple faith, however, in these sacred warnings, and their true reference to idolatry and other evils within the Church, drives away the thick cloud which else must have rested over the face of Providence. A true and solid philosophy of history will then dawn gradually upon our eyes. The history of the Gospel and the Church now appears in its true light, and becomes a mighty act in that great drama, where good and evil contend together, till the eternal triumph of righteousness and peace at the coming of the Lord.

The first theory which is thus set aside, and one of the most seducing, is the Infidel theory of progress. Man is here viewed as the agent

and source of his own regeneration. The light of science and the growth of intellect are to drain off the miseries and stanch the bleeding wounds of humanity; and without the need of Christian faith, or of Divine interference, an era of light and wisdom is to dawn gradually on the world.

But these warnings teach a different lesson. They remind us that man in his best estate is altogether vanity. They reveal a stubbornness of evil, which no light of grace has hitherto availed to extinguish, and which corrupts the very medicine designed for its cure. They shew us, with the clearest evidence, that evil, and not good, proceeds from the heart of man as its habitual fountain, and that every good and perfect gift must descend from above. They set before us no gradual advance, by quiet steps, of peace and human virtue, but "supernal grace contending with sinfulness of men," in a chequered and unceasing conflict, with many a relapse and many a partial recovery, the whole to issue at the last in a searching and fiery judgment. But while they reprove the falsehood of Infidel hopes, they also reveal a true progress of a different kind; a ceaseless unfolding of that eternal counsel of love, which, in spite of man's rebellion, will at length complete the redemption of our fallen world, and unite heaven and earth in one blessed family for ever.

The same truth is equally fatal to another school of historical thought—the school of sentiment and romance. History is here regarded in

the light of a diorama, where a succession of brilliant and stirring scenes is unfolded to the eye. It is a romance without a moral. The sole object is to steep the soul with the spirit of each passing age, to study human nature under new forms, and to nurture the feelings by an impartial sympathy with the thoughts and passionate desires of buried generations. The world's history is thus turned into a landscape, where every part, separately, is beautiful; but where there is no progress, nothing but a cycle of perpetual change; and all the gain which is traced in the lapse of years, is that a greater variety of objects is presented to feast the eye of imagination.

These Protestant warnings of God's word lead us to view history in a very different light. Each age of time, with its own various interests, is an onward step in a vast counsel of love, that reaches into eternity. The passions and stirring scenes that awaken the dreams of fancy, are solemn realities of human sin and corruption, which have left an enduring record in the book of God's remembrance against the day of judgment. The soul drinks of Lethe water no longer; the spell is reversed, and the panorama of childish fancy becomes the nursery of fears and hopes, high as heaven, deep as the grave, and solemn as eternity. The actors are yet to re-appear; the actions are to pass once more under the review of a holier judgment; and too many, alas! that have been decked in the bright and meretricious colouring of ardent fancy, will then be found to be merely a sorrowful echo to the voice of the foreseeing

Spirit, and a mournful proof that some, nay many, in the latter times, have departed from the faith.

But the true exposition of these Divine warnings is still more fatal to another system,—the school of tradition and ecclesiastical tyranny. There are those who extol the study of Church history, and yet reject nearly all the light which the Holy Spirit has supplied us to explain its true meaning. Their zeal spends itself in the vain effort to replace the errors and follies of our own time, by those of some distant age. They not only reject the Infidel views of human progress; they forget, or practically deny, the real progress of the Divine purpose of redemption. And hence they adopt the saying forbidden them by the wisest of men, "the former days were better than these," and look wistfully on the past, instead of hopefully to the future. To exalt the times on which their eyes rest with such a fond devotion, they palliate the worst superstitions of the Church, and ascribe to its rulers a promise of unfailing truth and wisdom, which the word of God has nowhere made to them. Church history, instead of a light, now becomes gross darkness. The acts of authority in synods or councils, the decrees of Popes, the ambitious claims of the priesthood, must now be justified at whatever cost; though conscience has to be hardened against human suffering, and truth to be lost and expire in an atmosphere of legendary falsehoods. The Catholic Church, in other words, the priesthood of the most numerous party in every conflict of opinion, must be infalli-

bly right; or else they see no escape from the hideous whirlpool of private judgment. Thus, because there is no faith to hold the truth firmly on its own direct evidence in God's word, sealed and confirmed by the conscience, they fall back into two errors, the most flatly opposed to their own maxims, and to the very foundations of the Christian faith. They count it folly to think of ascertaining the truth directly from God's word; it must be secured by the testimony of the Catholic Church. But this is only, in plain terms, the voice of the priesthood and rulers in the more numerous party. Thus, on the one hand, names and numbers are made the test of truth; and on the other, riches and exalted station, which the Scriptures always describe as a snare, are made the pledge of holiness, truth, and Divine wisdom. The wretched fruit of the whole is to turn the history of the Church into an arsenal of spiritual pride, and a nursery for the worst despotism, the tyranny of an apostate and idolatrous priesthood.

The express voice of the Holy Spirit, in this and similar passages, roots up the fatal delusion, with the school of historical thought reared on this basis; beautiful indeed above, with all feminine grace and dreams of fancy, but ending in the scales of Leviathan below. The spell of Catholic consent is broken. Church history is no longer an opiate for the conscience, a nursery of superstition, where our sympathies are always to take part with the strong against the weak, the many against the few; in short, with

proud and idolatrous rulers against the persecuted witnesses of truth. The balance is restored, and we are taught to hold it with a righteous judgment; remembering, on the one hand, the sure promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Christ's Church, builded on the rock of a true confession; and on the other, that there was to be a grand revolt from the faith, and doctrines of demon-worship, like a smoke from the abyss, were to cloud for long ages the glory of the Sun of Righteousness. In rising into a true philosophy of Providence, we are thus guarded from delusion on the right hand and on the left. Truth was to be perpetually kept alive in the Church, and we are bound to discern its presence in every age. Error and false worship were long to prevail; and we are bound equally to detect the fulfilment of the warning; and instead of reviving the superstitions of those times, to shrink from them with abhorrence, as the sins which the Holy Ghost has branded with His own deep and utter condemnation. For never can a true philosophy of history arise, which refuses or sets aside either of these great elements; the abounding of sin in the various windings of human perverseness; and the more plenteous abounding of Divine grace, and of God's mysterious wisdom, revealing itself in most varied forms of holiness and tenderness, of long suffering forbearance, and of righteous judgment.

Such is the real beauty and glory of that interpretation, which a shallow philosophy is so ready to despise. It restores the history of the

Church to its true and natural place in the scheme of Divine truth. It now becomes the second main step in the conflict of good and evil, of which the first is embodied in the wonderful mystery, "God manifest in the flesh." It destroys the proud fancies of human perfectibility; but reveals in their place the sure covenant of redemption, which, through clouds and thick darkness, through years of delusion and ages of apostasy, advances with firm and steady pace to its final triumph. It sweeps away the butterfly sporting of historic fancies, that would turn the intense realities of moral probation into a diorama of bewitching scenery, where the spirit may flit lightly from flower to flower, but traces no progress, and detects no hidden counsel of the Most High. In their place it sets before us a spectacle the most affecting in its interest, and the most solemn in its issue. Millions of immortal souls, in successive generations, are seen to rise up from the great deep of the unknown, and enter on a short probation under the eye of heaven. Light and darkness, in each of their spirits, contend for the victory. And many, alas! with the great and wonderful mystery of Divine love set full in their view, turn perversely away, and eagerly betake themselves to the commandments of men and doctrines of demons. But all alike, the deceived and the deceivers, and the faithful remnant who bow not their knee to Baal, are hastening to a great account; where the judgment of self-righteous Pharisees, and the sportive follies and fancies of the worldling, shall be hushed into

silence by the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God. In the light of that glory, the giant shadow of evil, which once, under holy names, had such a power to deceive, will be discovered in its true weakness. The voice of antiquity, Catholic consent, though it were that of ages and of nations, when they would bow the conscience to Christian idolatry, will shrink and shrivel away into a mournful echo of the Divine warning, and a proof that some immortal spirits, in their solemn probation here below, have departed from the faith to their own ruin.

But it is time to pass on to the last subject of our present inquiry, and to shew the harmony of the present truth with the highest and purest instincts of a renewed imagination. It is under the shield of taste and fancy, and by weapons borrowed from the armoury of the imagination, that Protestant truth is now peculiarly assailed. The dry forms of logical argument will never avail of themselves to resist the evil, and stay the infection of the plague. Youthful and ardent minds will be loath to forsake a creed of seeming grandeur and beauty, of sentiment and mystery, unless Protestant doctrines are set before them in some brighter aspect than a mere detection of the sins of our forefathers.

The true remedy for the danger is to unfold these warnings of God's Spirit, not only in their connexion with the darkness of the past, but with the brightness of the future glory. The conflict of good and evil, and the whole course of

redemption, is revealed in successive forms to the Christian; in the person of the Son of God, in the Church of past ages, and in the future dispensation of righteousness and the promised restitution of all things. We may, in the ardour of a lively fancy, reject all Protestant truth, as Ahab rejected Micaiah, because its voice has a harsh and forbidding sound; and prefer, with the music of psaltery and dulcimer, to erect the Church Visible and Catholic into an idol, and offer to it the incense of a fond and poetic devotion. But then the spiritual, like the literal Jericho, has to be rebuilded at a double cost; a dark cloud immediately obscures the mystery of godliness; and the future hopes of the Church have to be buried in oblivion, and blotted out from before the eye of the soul.

On the other hand, a right view of Protestant truth, in its bearing on the history of the Church, opens a wide and noble field to the thoughts, whether we look backward to the history of the Lord himself, or forward to the coming regeneration of the earth. When we accept the visible church of past ages as the due and full expounder of the Gospel, Ichabod is written at once upon its Divine beauty. Even infidels can observe and feel the contrast. Thus Gibbon remarks,—"Many indulge the pleasing task of describing religion as she descended from heaven, arrayed in her native purity. A more melancholy duty is imposed on the historian. He must discover the inevitable mixture of error and

corruption, which she contracted in a long residence on earth, among a weak and degenerate race of beings."

Now whenever the visible Church of all past ages is accepted for the fit and due exponent of the Gospel in its true features and original design, which is done by those who narrow and pare down these warnings of the Holy Spirit; then the distinction is lost, and the Christian religion, like its Author, is betrayed by the kiss of its seeming friends. The free grace of God is hidden behind a thick cloud of will-worship and penance. His pure and spotless holiness, whose name is "Jealous," and "who will not give his glory to another," is buried under dark clouds of saint and virgin worship, darkening the throne of the Almighty with a smoke from the abyss. The tenderness of God's love, and the exuberance of his goodness, are exchanged for the visions of a harsh and fanatic rigour, the refusal of his choicest and noblest gifts, and the foul and bloody horrors of cruel and unrelenting bigotry. Thus Infidelity is armed with its keenest shafts, and a message of the richest mercy so deformed by superstition, that, as with the ruined Archangel, scarcely any trace of its original brightness can beam out upon us through the darkness. The loss in the hopes of the Church is equally great. Those who pine for the days of monastic gloom, and aim to revive the corpse of old superstitions, are never found to dwell with rapture on the coming restitution, and have no taste for exploring the

deep treasures of joy, in the glorious promises to Israel and the whole world in the latter days. Even when a bright glimpse dawns in God's providence, that gives warning of that daybreak as at hand, they frown upon it with cold and chilling suspicions. They reverse the promise to those who pray for the peace of Jerusalem; and pray that the first dawnings of bright hope to Zion after her long desolation "may be as if they had never been." The spirit that recoils back into ages of superstitious darkness can never be one of glad and joyful hope; for the owl was never seen to borrow the song of the lark, nor to rise upward to greet the first beams of morning with sunshine on its wings.

But once restore its due honour to this express voice of the Spirit, and it throws a light backward and forward, that reveals unknown and unsuspected glories to the spiritual imagination. The corruptions of the Church, which before veiled from the eyes the great mystery of godliness, now invest it with a halo of richer splendour and beauty. Why is so deep a brand here placed on the worship of saints and angels, and of the Blessed Virgin, as a doctrine of seducing spirits, an apostasy from the faith? Is not the holy Virgin "blessed among women," even to all generations? Are not the martyrs of Christ glorious and honourable, and the angels that excel in strength and brightness worthy of all honour from the children of the dust? Why then is the stamp of so deep a condemnation placed on a system so specious and attractive, and where such thronging fancies and

high emotions seem to find a natural home? Clearly it is because of the infinite distance between God and the creature, and the derogation from His glory, when the creature shares that religious worship which is due to Him alone. No refined distinctions will suffice; and, *latria*, and *dulia*, and *hyperdulia*, and all the terms of a vain theology, can never bridge over this immeasurable gulf. Does not this one truth, seen in this light, and confirmed by a warning so solemn, invest the mystery of godliness with a deeper power? We do well to honour the saints and the angels with all honour which God has not forbidden. We can scarcely raise our conceptions too high, of the blessed and holy fellowship already prepared for the children of God. We may picture to ourselves ten thousand forms of grace and beauty, of dignity and tenderness, the affections of earth refined and ennobled by the majesty of heaven, and they may still be exceeded and surpassed by the bright reality. But one further truth remains, and the Spirit of God has here written it with a sunbeam in this stern condemnation of evil. Beyond the glory of the saints and angels, there is a glory infinitely higher, and in which they are lost as stars in the sunshine of heaven. There is an element of joy, which swallows up all the rest with its superior depth and power,—the knowledge, the love, the fruition of God himself. "They shall see his face, and his name shall be on their foreheads." Beyond all the mysteries, though real and wonderful, of ministering angels, and saints that are

now awaiting their crown, there is a higher mystery, unspeakable in its glory, "God manifest in the flesh, seen of angels, believed on in the world, and received up into glory." Man's earthly soul is ever tending to degrade the God of heaven, first to the level of angels, then of men, then of stars, and the elements, and at length to the grosser idols of wood and stone. By this solemn protest, the Holy Spirit would teach us to reverse the hateful course of apostasy and profanation. We may rise higher and higher in our conceptions of those blessed spirits who surround the throne of the Almighty, and even of the preciousness of the immortal souls who are ransomed from among men. But we are here solemnly charged to place in our thoughts an immeasurable gulf of separation between the excellence of the most exalted creature and the incommunicable glory of the one true and only God, and of the one true and only Mediator of God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, who is himself, "God over all, blessed for ever."

This truth, once seen clearly, and held firmly, reveals with new lustre both the condescension and the majesty of our Lord. For the mystery of iniquity, in saint and angel worship, acts by a double power of falsehood to pervert the truth. It dishonours the majesty of Jehovah, by receiving other gods and objects of worship before his face, and thus debases and denies his Divine Majesty. But it also sets at nought the condescension of the Son of God, and denies the fulness of his sympathy, as the Son of Man who

has stooped to become nearer to us than the angels themselves, and whose deep sympathies of love and forbearing grace far exceed those which can be found in his Virgin mother, or in the tenderest and most gracious of His brethren. The stern rejection, therefore, uttered by the express voice of the Spirit, when traced to its innermost sense and meaning, is the sternness of offended love. It is not only the everlasting Son who rejects with holy jealousy the association of creatures with God the Father in the acts of religious worship. It is the Saviour of sinners, the Son of David, the "man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," who repels and denounces, with a holy vehemence of love, the falsehood that would rob him of his true and vast pre-eminence in deep tenderness of sympathy towards the sinful and suffering children of men. And thus the prophetic warning, rightly applied, and searched to its fountain, reveals to us doubly the unsearchable glory of Christ, the infinite height of his Divine Majesty, and his unapproachable depth of condescension, in the sympathies of a tender and forbearing love.

The same doctrine, unfolded in this treatise, throws its light also forward on the hope of the Church, and the prospects of the coming redemption. We have only to reverse the features of the Apostasy here portrayed, and they will be rendered parables and earnests of the good things to come.

Two chief marks of the Apostasy are here given. Its essence lies in a revolt from allegiance

to God, as the sole object of worship, and from the Son of God, as the one all-sufficient Mediator between God and men. The creative influence, in the mind of its patrons, is a spurious self-denial, the fruit of fear and pride, not of confidence and love; in those who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats which God has created for his servants to enjoy. Thus God is dishonoured alike by partners in his worship, and by a practical denial of the free riches of his bounty to man. One error degrades Him, practically, to a level with his own creatures; the other, while it views Him as an austere taskmaster, envious of the happiness of others, almost degrades Him to the rank of a fallen sinner. In the contrast of these two evils a clear light is thrown on the future hopes of the Church, and the happiness now in store for the children of God.

To begin with the lower aspect of the change, it is clear how much religion has been dishonoured in time past by the uncommanded and pernicious austerities of a fanatic zeal. But here it is needful to advance with humility and with cautious steps. Self-denial, however unnatural its form, ought seldom to be an object of contempt, and least of all in a self-indulgent age. There may be misdirected sacrifices, which it is easier to blame than to imitate, and a kernel of Divine grace may often have been hidden under the hard shell of a spiritual pride. There are some sentences of Mede, in which this judgment of charity seems almost to be forgotten. We ought at least to suspend all harshness of censure on the sacrifices

of superstition, until we are conscious of equal self-denial in a holier cause, and under the higher motives which a purer faith ought to supply. If we neglect this caution, our invectives, in proportion to their vehemence, must repel generous and impartial minds, and will also lay us open to a severe rule of measurement on the judgment-day.

Still it is a deep truth, that self-denial has two forms, almost opposite in their source, and in the fruits to which they severally lead. One has its origin in pride, and the other in love. The fallen spirit may disdain the trammels of the body, and cross all its sensual instincts, and yet only approach thereby to a closer resemblance to Satan himself, in whom no carnal distraction interferes with the pure energy of spiritual wickedness. But Christian self-denial resembles that of Christ himself. It is a victory over pride, no less than over sensual temptation. Its lower stage is a conquest of the animal desires, and patient hunger in the wilderness. Its higher fruit is humility on the pinnacle of spiritual greatness, content to veil its own depth in the gentler enjoyment of God's mercies. "The Son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

Now the austere self-denial of pride is the source of a religion, alike displeasing to God and contrary to man. It dries up all the gentler forms of human enjoyment. But this is not its worst evil. It obscures and defames the Divine bounty, and erecting itself always into a self-righteous

claim of merit, annuls the Gospel, and makes the cross of Christ of no effect. Such a Christianity, in past ages, has been a stumbling-block to thousands and millions of souls, and a foul abomination in the eyes of God himself.

But the passage before us opens to our imagination a delightful contrast. The corruption will not last for ever. The creatures of God shall not always be perverted from the end for which they were created, either by the sensuality of lust, or the dark selfishness of spiritual pride. They were created to be "received with thanksgiving by them that believe, and have known the truth." And in the days to come their high purpose shall be fulfilled. Religion will lay aside the funeral robes in which superstition and will-worship have arrayed her, and appear in her true beauty, bearing in her hand a princely law of love, that forbids none of God's creatures to the enjoyment of His children, but only instructs them how to extract from all the fullest and the richest blessings. Hitherto, between sensual profligacy, and morose, ascetic pride, the revenue has been too scanty, of happiness to man, and of praise to God their Creator. But then the words will be amply realized—"All thy works praise thee, O Lord, and thy saints bless thee." The dwellers upon the earth, in that kingdom of peace, shall have the full and holy enjoyment of Divine bounty. "They shall build houses, and inhabit them, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them." Then will be heard sounds far different from the hollow, heartless laughter of the reveller, or the groans

of the self-tortured anchorite—"the voice of joy and the voice of gladness; the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride; the voice of them that shall say—Praise the Lord of hosts; for the Lord is good, for his mercy endureth for ever: and of them that bring the sacrifice of praise into the house of the Lord of hosts."

There may be a pleasure, doubtless, in moonlight reverie amidst the remains of antiquity and the stately memorials of the Church in past ages. The "high, embowed roof," "the long-drawn aisle, and fretted vault" may inspire a dim, and sometimes a holy reverence. But the soul, while it gazes and admires, must still feel a deep craving and void within, and a chill damp, as of the charnel-house, lies around it. The moonlight may be beautiful, but it falls on the mists of gloomy superstition, and rests on the solitude of a moral wilderness.

How far brighter is the field of hope set before us, when every creature of God, as here predicted, shall be received with thanksgiving, and be sanctified by the Word of God, and by prayer! The view of the Church in the days of apostasy, and in the times of restitution, is not a contrast of gloomy, yet solemn mystery, with a scene of light and trivial enjoyment. Joy, it is true, will abound, when every creature is redeemed from vanity to the use of man; but surely mystery will not be wanting. For how should they be set free from vanity, unless it be that heavenly and mysterious goodness has reclaimed them for its own? The works of God, seen in their true light, as His gifts

to man, will be invested with a double glory. They will borrow a deep meaning from the immortal soul, to whose good they now minister, and a deeper still from that Omniscient Wisdom, which has filled them with such various treasures of Divine grace. All creatures will be seen once again in the light of that great purpose for which they were created, when the God of heaven looked down upon them, and, behold, they were very good. In the flowers and the trees, the rivers and the mountains, the clouds and the showers, and all the living things upon earth, will be seen an inexhaustible treasury of wisdom, which not only supplies the immediate wants of the body, but is stored with a rich reserve of truth and grace for the immortal souls of men. In each object, so infinitely various, through every field of nature and walk of art, the word of God will first be taken to unfold its true purpose, and to invest it with a high and holy mystery. Prayer will then arise over it, as a priestly consecration, that God may be glorified, and man himself be blessed in receiving the Divine bounty. And last of all, when the vintage of mercy from every creature has been crushed by a skilful hand, and poured into the cup of blessing, there will be renewed thanksgiving to the God of love, and deeper adoration of his boundless goodness, who giveth richly all things to enjoy. How can we reckon up the amount of holy gladness, when science shall pour down her various stores at the foot of the cross; when human art shall minister, not to pride and luxury, but to the deepest emotions of

praise, and the hearts of God's people become altars of incense, on which creation shall offer up the fragrance of all its hidden stores in tribute to its Maker.

Still more heavenly and glorious is the prospect, when the other feature of the Apostasy is also reversed, and made an augury of the coming kingdom of God. There might be some fear, if we were to dwell on the removal of ascetic will-worship alone, that the Christian hope might sink into the near resemblance of a Mahometan Paradise. But when we turn to the other feature of that hope, drawn equally from this voice of the Spirit, the balance is restored. The sin of the Apostasy lies in confounding together, in a common worship, the creature and the Creator. The redemption will therefore be marked, above all other features, by a clear manifestation of the infinite pre-eminence of God. The creatures, it is true, will pour their fullest tide of blessing into the bosom of His children on earth. But there will be another aspect of their joy, immeasurably higher still, and these lower gifts will be little else than mirrors to reflect its brightness. It is their joy in God himself, the adoration and love of Him, who is the source of every good and perfect gift, and whose hand alone has filled the creatures with goodness, and clothed them with their exquisite beauty. No created being, man or angel, may share in His incommunicable glory, or be a partner in His worship; and all the happiness which flows from the creatures in their best and highest estate, falls equally short of that pure river of joy which

issues from the throne of God and of the Lamb for ever and ever.

Combine these two elements of thought only, and how immeasurable is the vista of hope, and how unutterable its beauty, which is opened before the Church of God! The dreams of a superstitious awe may seem wonderful and noble for a little time; but they are, after all, shadows which lessen with the sunrise, and disappear. But the Protestant application of these warnings, seen in its true light, scatters those clouds of awe and gloomy mystery, to replace them by joys still more deeply mysterious, when every creature of God shall be tasked to the uttermost with a message of mercy and a voice of gladness to the faithful; and yet all their streams be infinitely surpassed by the goodness that still abides unsearchably in the everlasting Fountain, when God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

And now I would close by a short paraphrase of the whole passage, which may serve for a practical application of the Treatise to the dangers and duties of the Church in the present day.

We live in an age when every field of thought is actively tilled. Science, art, and history, have all multiplied their discoveries, and are daily enlarging the bounds of human knowledge. The attention is distracted by the various fields of thought which lie open to our view. Astronomy has disclosed the magnificence and grandeur of the starry universe. Geology seems to have detected unknown ages of animal life, before our planet was finally prepared for the habitation of

man. Chemistry and its kindred sciences have explored secrets of nature, hidden from all past ages; secret laws and mysterious influences, which reveal themselves in every hue of light that sparkles in the dewdrop, no less than in the colours of the rainbow, and the lightnings and meteors of the sky. History has carried her researches into remotest ages, and the most distant countries of the world; and hieroglyphics, sealed for thousands of years, have yielded their secrets to her skill. China, in the East, and the ruins of Copan, in the furthest West, the monuments of the Pharaohs, the villages of Canaan, the remains of Etruria, the tribes of the desert, the ruins of Edom and of Sheba, the sites of Nineveh and plains of Nimrod, have all, in their turn, enriched the present generation with the view of long-forgotten wonders in the history of the world.

But amidst this bewildering variety of facts and discoveries, there is one central truth which stands out in relief beyond all the rest. The mysteries of science are great, the discoveries of historical research are wonderful; but, without controversy, far greater and more wonderful is the mystery of godliness. He who has formed the hosts of the starry universe, and hidden secret wonders without end in the bowels of the earth, has visited this planet in his mercy; and the God who filled the highest heaven with His glorious presence, has become manifest in one province of our earth, in mortal flesh. Here He has chosen to discover his glory in forms of condescension, more wonderful than all the

mysteries which science can reveal. He came to fulfil a work none else could accomplish, to reconcile infinite justice with infinite mercy, and bear the heavy burden of a world's guilt. But the darkness of the moral gloom in which He shrouded his glory for a time, only revealed by contrast his triumphant power and goodness. He who was charged by his own voluntary condescension with all the sins of a lost world, prevailed over all by His divine righteousness, and was "justified in the Spirit" by His resurrection from the grave. The love which had filled heaven with its brightness from the beginning, here, on this fallen planet, disclosed itself in new forms, unsuspected before by the blessed spirits who worship in His presence, and the Incarnate God was "seen of angels" invested with a brighter glory of love than heaven itself had revealed. A truth so wonderful, and which must fill the universe with perpetual adoration, might not be shut up in one province of the earth. A love so deep would not shrink from bestowing its treasures on the most wretched outcasts, and the Son of God, in all the riches of his grace, was "preached among" idolatrous "Gentiles." The message was not in vain. The light of heaven pierced through that gross darkness, and He was also "believed on in the world." The lost race of mankind were thus, by the love of God Incarnate, restored to the hope of immortality, and the promise of life eternal. But He who had wrought this strange work of mercy withdrew himself from the gaze of the creatures He had

redeemed by his death, and while the message of his love was blessing sinners on earth, the manifested God was received once more into the incommunicable glory from which He came.

Such a truth, we might have supposed, when once revealed, would be secure of an universal welcome. Every heart must leap to hail the message, and every other truth which can occupy the thought of man fade into comparative oblivion before its brightness. But the Spirit warns us expressly against a mistake so natural, and yet so dangerous. He who searches the deep things of God, sees a depth of perverseness in sin that rivals for a time the depth of Divine love. The message of God Incarnate would avail far more widely to awaken the consciences of men from the sleep of sin to the terrors of judgment, than to subdue them into the happy confidence of love. And this wide interval, between awakened conscience and true Christian faith, would be filled up by delusions from the Powers of darkness. The Spirit proclaims, then, for our warning, that "in after times, some" even of those who professedly receive that mystery, "would depart" from its living power, and refuse to rest with a simple faith in the work of God himself for their salvation. Their souls would be alarmed with the sure prospect of judgment, and yet unwilling to be saved freely by grace, through the work of the Son of God. This void would be filled up busily, by seducing spirits, with will-worship in its various forms; and chiefly with idolatrous rites and superstitions, the demon-

worship that prevailed before in the heathen world. The one doctrine of true godliness would be practically set aside by many "doctrines of demons," or various forms of eager superstition, addressed to evil spirits clothed with the attributes and titles of angels or men. To these men would give heed, and the saving truth be neglected for their sake. Saints without number, and holy angels, relics and images, crosses and wafer hosts, a thousand "doctrines" of costly but faithless devotion, will cloud from their eyes that heavenly mystery, which had dawned with surpassing splendour on a ruined world. The Holy Spirit foresaw the width of the delusion, and its inveterate power. But dwelling in the light of His own eternal goodness, He looks on the darkest forms of evil as only shadows that must soon pass away. Even though the multitude of Christians, as of the Jews at the foot of the mount, may thus revolt in their hearts, and worship the molten image, still in His sight they are only a handful of rebels, "a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again." Some of the Jews "did provoke Him" in the wilderness, almost the whole congregation, except the two witnesses, Joshua and Caleb, who continued faithful. And so also the mass of Christians might fall into this foul demon-worship, except the "two witnesses of Christ," the remnant of believers. But still the Spirit, in either case, teaches us to despise the consent of numbers in error and sin, and to look forward beyond these passing shadows. Some of the Jews, he tells us, did provoke, and some

Christians, he also tells us, shall depart from the faith, and give heed to the doctrines of demons. But still, *hæ nubeculæ transibunt*, these clouds that appear so gloomy shall pass away, and eternal truth and light dawn upon the world in the Saviour's kingdom.

But while many would be the victims of this delusion, there are some, the Spirit further announces, far guiltier than the rest, who are its abettors and patrons. First deceived by their own pride, they become the deceivers of the multitude. Truth is forsaken for pious frauds, and the sure oracles of God for legends of saints, and tales of seductive falsehood. By this habitual disregard of truth, contenting themselves, in its room, to say what is needful for their own position, and the objects, fancied to be holy, which they have in view; their moral tone sinks rapidly, till the conscience itself becomes seared and hardened. They can then call evil good and good evil. The highest spiritual pretensions can then be found in unnatural league with fraud and falsehood, and open dishonesty. The landmarks of moral uprightness are carried away headlong in the stream of growing superstition, till the murder of Christ's witnesses comes at length to be thought an acceptable service to God. But evils so foul need to be covered by some specious shows of virtue, and pride is left to make the selection. To subdue the animal nature, to bid defiance, at once to the grosser forms of appetite, and to the natural instincts which God has sanctioned and ordained; these are the weapons of their spiritual

strength, the mighty instruments by which to work on the popular mind, and help on the growing apostasy from the faith. And thus, after all the wonders of Divine love in the Incarnation, a dark cloud would rest for ages on the history of the Church, and never be fully removed till the angel reapers go forth for the great and final separation. Then the hypocrites will be severed from the faithful; the Vial poured into the air will abolish and consume all the demon powers of darkness, and the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

Such appears, on every ground of criticism, of analogy, of scriptural induction, and pure reason, to be the true scope of the prediction unfolded in the following work. Some, both in our Church and our nation, seem now to be departing from the true faith once more, or from all zeal in its behalf, and the spirits of demons, announced by another Apostle, are reviving all the maxims and usages of Christian idolatry. Surely then it is our duty to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. No sword will avail in this conflict but the sword of the Spirit, the word of the living God, with earnest exposure of the deceivers, and intercession for the deceived. These warnings of prophecy are the standard of the Spirit, reared in the battle field of the Church, to beat down and overcome the power of the enemy. May we never, by our carelessness or unbelief, betray it into the hands of our spiritual foes. As the conflict grows in its earnestness, let us apply more earnestly to that

Divine armoury, where the weapons are provided for the overthrow of the Christian Babylon; and above all, to that throne of grace, where we may obtain strength for our own duty in the battle-field, and pardon and deliverance for those who are led astray.

Our faith, even in Protestant truth, if it would stand in the trial, must not rest on the traditions of our fathers, but be drawn fresh from the pure fountains in the word of God. Our zeal, if it is to resist a subtle and winning delusion, while it retains all its firmness, must clothe itself with the meekness of heavenly wisdom, and the tenderness of compassionate love. Our testimony to win the heart, as well as the judgment, must include more than a negative protest against evil, and an exposure of the sins of our forefathers. It must follow the unfolding mystery of God's holy Providence in ages past, and include the bright hope of that glory which will dawn upon the world, when Babylon and all its witching sorceries of idolatries newly refined, shall be overthrown for ever. Thus we may trust, that by the Divine blessing, many souls may be rescued from the snare, and restored to a living faith in God our incarnate Saviour, to the lively hope of His future kingdom, and a blessed share in the glory which will then be revealed.

*** In the present edition, the quotations have been chiefly transferred to the foot of each page, as more convenient for general readers, and the longer notes to the end. The text is that of the folio edition, with a few slight verbal changes, to soften the roughness of the style; but these alterations do not extend to the sense, and even the words of the author have been very seldom altered. Such of the quotations as were easily accessible have also been compared anew with the authors; but the accuracy of Mede seemed to render a more laborious revision needless.

THE

APOSTASY OF THE LATTER TIMES.

A TREATISE ON 1 TIM. IV. 1—3.

"Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις, καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων,

"Ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν,

"Κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων, &c."

Which I conceive may be thus translated:—

"*Howbeit the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall revolt from the Faith, attending to erroneous Spirits, and Doctrines of Demons;*

"*Through the hypocrisy of liars having seared consciences;*

"*Forbidding to marry, and* commanding *to abstain from meats, &c.*"

CHAPTER I.

The dependence of the text upon the last verse in the foregoing chapter.—Why, in the description of the mystery of godliness, the words (assumed into glory) are set last.—A view of the several parts of the text, containing the method and order of the ensuing discourse.—The Author's three reasons for rendering the text differently from the common translation.

THE words I have read are a prophecy of a revolt of Christians from the *great mystery of Christian worship*, described in the last verse

of the former chapter, which, according to the division of the ancients, should be the first of this. For that last verse, together with the first six verses of this, and half the seventh verse, make the seventh title or main section of this epistle, expressed in the edition of *Robert Stephen;* and so are supposed, from the grounds of that division, to belong all to one argument. The words, therefore, of my text depend upon the last of the former chapter, as the second part of a discrete proposition; that howsoever *the mystery of the Christian religion*, which is, *God manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, and received up into glory*, was a *great* one, and at that time *preached* and *believed on in the world;* nevertheless, *the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times there shall be a revolt* or *departing from this faith*, though not in all parts of it, yet from a main and fundamental part thereof—namely, the *assumption of this God and man to the throne of glory* and incommunicable majesty in heaven, whereby He hath a name given him above every name, and whereof no creature in heaven or in earth can be capable. This connexion is the reason why the apostle putteth this *assumption into glory* in the last part of his description; which should else in the true order have followed the words, *justified in the spirit*, and come before the words, *preached unto the Gentiles*, and *believed on in the world.* [This is plain; for the order of events was this: God was—1. Manifest in the

flesh—2. Justified in the spirit—3. Received up into glory—4. Seen of angels—5. Preached unto the Gentiles—6. Believed on in the world.] But it is the method of Scripture sometimes to transpose the natural order, and to mention that in the last place, whereunto it has to join, and whence it is to infer, the next words that follow after. And unless this reason be allowed here, there will scarce be found any other for this misplacing. But more of this shall both be spoken and made better to appear hereafter.

I come now more near to my text, which I divide into two parts:—First. *A description of this solemn apostasy* in the first verse:—Secondly. *The manner or means whereby it should come to pass*, in the following verses, to wit—*through the hypocrisy of liars who had seared consciences, forbad to marry, and* bade *to abstain from meats.*

For the *description of the apostasy itself*, we shall find it FIRST, expressed *generally* in the words *they shall apostatize*,* or *revolt;* and in the next,† *they shall attend to erroneous doctrines* or *doctrines of error.* Then, *particularly*—1. *What these erroneous doctrines should be, as to the kind or quality;* namely, new doctrines of demons, or a new idolatry. 2. *The persons who should thus apostatize;* not all, but ‡ SOME. 3. *The time when it should be; in the latter times.* 4. *The proof or warrant of this prophecy;* it is that which the Spirit hath elsewhere long

* ἀποστήσονται.

† προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις. ‡ TINES.

ago foretold in the written word *expressly*,* or in express words.

For the second part, viz., *the means*. Consider, 1. *The manner or method used to bring it in*—to wit, *lying hypocrisy*, or *hypocritical lying*. 2. *The quality and description of these authors and furtherers of the apostasy;* they would be such as *had their consciences seared, who forbad marriage and meats*.

Where, before I go any farther, I must state why I thus translate these latter words, which I make the second part; because they are commonly translated otherwise, or *intransitively*, as referring the words of the two latter verses to the persons mentioned in the first; the *some* who would apostatize and give heed to *doctrines of devils*, as they usually translate it. So that the words of the second and third verses would be merely an explanation of what *the giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils*, mentioned in the first verse, was; would be, in fact, an expression, by *particulars*, of that which was before *generally* comprised under *seducing spirits and doctrines of devils*, which should consist partly *in forbidding lawful marriage*, and partly *in commanding abstinence from meats*.

But this interpretation seems very unlikely. For, first, since St. Paul intendeth here to describe that great apostasy of the visible Christian Church, as is evident by the pointing out of the time, *in the latter times;* who can believe that he would instance only in the smaller and

* ῥητῶς, *verbatim, totidem verbis.*

almost circumstantial errors, omitting the main and fundamental, which the Scripture elsewhere telleth us would be *idolatry* or *spiritual fornication?* Secondly, errors about marriage and meats were not peculiar to the last times, but were found, more or less, in the apostles' own times, as may be gathered from their epistles. Why, then, should our Apostle, here speaking of the *apostasy of the latter times*, instance only in such things as the *first times* were, in some measure, never free from? Lastly (which I take to be alone sufficient), the syntax of the words will not bear to have them so translated.* But to translate the passage as I do, as it keepeth the syntax true, so I hope to make it appear hereafter to be the very meaning, whereunto the event is most answerable. You shall have it proved out of history that the apostasy of the visible Church came in by lying wonders and all deceivableness of unrighteousness, managed by those who either professed or doted upon monastical

* For the persons in the first verse, τινὲς προσέχοντες, are expressed in the nominative, whereas the persons in the verses following, ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων, κωλυόντων, are in the genitive: now, by what syntax can these be construed intransitively? It would be a breach of grammar unsampled in our Apostle's epistles. If any say the latter may agree with δαιμονίων, that, indeed, would be a strange sense, and nothing to their purpose; to say that *devils lie, have seared consciences*, and *forbid marriage and meats*. But to construe it *transitively*, and to make all these genitive cases to be governed by ἐν ὑποκρίσει, and take the preposition ἐν to signify *causam*, or *modum actionis*, as is most usual in Scripture, keepeth the syntax true.

hypocrisy; the affectation and errors whereof at length surprising the body of the Church, is that which St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 10) calls, not the apostasy itself, but a *not-love of the truth*, for which *God gave them over to strong delusions, that they might believe a lie.*

But this is out of its place; only I have anticipated thus much, lest you should be too long in suspense concerning the grounds of this novelty in translating. And yet this difficulty concerning the syntax hath stumbled many of our later interpreters, as among others Beza, who solves it only by saying that the Apostle more regarded the matter than the construction; which, for my part, I cannot believe.

CHAPTER II.

Apostasy in the Scripture imports revolt, *or* rebellion.—*That* Idolatry *is such, is proved from several passages in Scripture.—By* spirits *in the text, are meant* doctrines. —*Doctrines of demons are to be taken passively, viz., for doctrines concerning demons.—Several instances of the like form of speech in Scripture.*

I RETURN now unto the first part of my text *the description of that solemn apostasy;* where I will consider the five parts or points thereof as I have propounded them, though it be not according to the order of the words. And first in the more *general* expression, as I called it, in the words,* *shall revolt from the faith, giving heed to erroneous spirits.*

Some *shall revolt.* That is as much as to say, *shall make an apostasy.* Now apostasy (Ἀποστασία) in the Scripture's use, when it looks towards a person, signifies a revolt or rebellion; when toward God, a spiritual revolt from God, or rebellion against divine majesty, whether total, or by idolatry and serving other Gods. For the Seventy, whence the New Testament borrows the usage of speech, usually translates by this word the Hebrew verb *marad,* to rebel, and *mered,* rebellion; both which, when they have reference to a spiritual sovereignty, mean nought else but idolatry and serving of other gods, as may appear, Josh. xxii. 19, where the Israelites supposing their brethren the Reubenites and

* ἀποστήσονται τῆς πίστεως, προσέχοντες πνέυμασι πλάνοις.

Gadites, in building another altar upon the banks of Jordan, had meant to have forsaken the Lord and served other gods, said unto them, *timrodu, You have rebelled against the Lord,* and presently *Rebel not against the Lord, nor rebel against us;* where the Seventy hath, *be not apostates from the Lord and apostatize not from us.** And in v. 22, *mered, rebellion,* is translated *apostasy* † in the words, *the Lord God of Gods he knoweth if it be in rebellion or in transgression against the Lord.* Also, Num. xiv. 9, when the people would have renounced the Lord upon the report of the spies, Joshua and Caleb spake unto them *al timrodu, Rebel ye not:* where the Seventy hath,‡ *Be not apostates from the Lord.* So Nehem. ix. 26, in that repentant confession which the Levites make of the idolatries of their nation, *they were disobedient,* say they, *vayimredu, and rebelled against thee;* where the Seventy hath, *they apostatized from thee.* § And Daniel, in the like confession, ix. 9, says, *maradnu, we have rebelled against him,* but the Seventy, *we have apostatized.* ‖ So the idolatry of Ahaz, 2 Chron. xxviii., xxix., is by the same interpreters called *his apostasy* and he *revolted greatly (apostatized with apostasy) from the Lord.* ¶

I will not trouble you with the places where *marad,* translated *apostatize* ** is used for

* ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μὴ ἀποστάται γενήθητε, καὶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν μὴ ἀποστῆτε.

† ἀποστασία. ‡ μὴ ἀποστάται γίνεσθε.

§ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ σοῦ. ‖ ἀπέστημεν.

¶ Ἀπέστη ἀποστάσει ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. ** ἀφίστημι.

treason and rebellion against earthly princes, which are many. It is sufficient to gather from what we have quoted, that apostasy having reference to a sovereignty and lordship, betokens a withdrawing of service and subjection therefrom; which if the sovereignty and majesty be divine, is done by idolatry and service of other Gods, as well as if the majesty of the true God were renounced altogether. The use of the New Testament is answerable. Heb. iii. 12, "*Take heed lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief* in departing (apostatizing) from the living God.*" And, which is more near to our purpose, St. Paul, in 2 Thess. ii. 3, means no other thing in his prophecy of the man of sin, by *falling away*, than Christian Idolatry; his words are, *unless that Apostasy come first,*† that is, unless there be a breach of allegiance and of the faith given unto Christ, by idolatry under Antichrist. The like, therefore, I conclude to be intended in my text by—*they shall apostatize from the faith*, namely, that in the latter times men should break their oath of fidelity to Christ, which is, that in and through Him alone they should approach and worship the Divine Majesty. And so hath the use of the word Apostasy (Ἀποστασία) taught us something, or at least it hath wrought an indefinite suspicion of what should befall Christians in the *latter times*. However we are yet in suspense whether this departing from Christ and the mystery of godliness should

* ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι.

† ἐαν μὴ ἐλθῇ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον.

be *total*, in not acknowledging him at all, or whether *heretical*, in serving others beside him. For the Jews, we know, when they forsook the Lord most, yet did not forsake him altogether; but their *Apostasy* was in not serving him only and alone, but others besides him, as calves, the host of Heaven, and Baalim.

2. Let us, therefore, see if the next general words will afford us yet further information, viz., *attending to erroneous spirits*, or as some read, *spirits of error*.* It would be unprofitable and tedious to tell here of the diverse use of this word, *spirit*, in Scripture. Some take it in this place for doctors of spiritual things, and so the words would mean, doctors of errors.

But I had rather take *spirits* in this place for *doctrines* themselves; for so divines observe it to be used, 1 John iv. 1, *Believe not every spirit*, i. e. every doctrine, *but try the spirits if they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world;* and so, onward in that chapter, *the spirit of Antichrist* signifies the *false doctrine of Antichrist*. So if this sense be admitted, we are something less in suspense than we were, and may guess that this revolt should not be total but heretical. For we shall not easily find the word *spirit* to be otherwise used but either for the doctrines or doctors of Christianity, or for heresies under the same. It seems, therefore, to be some revolt from Christ by Idolatry, even in those who would seem to worship him.

But suppose it be so, yet still are we in suspense what these *erroneous and idolatrous*

* πνέυμασι πλάνης.

doctrines might be; for idolatry, as we may see in the Jewish apostasies, was of diverse kinds, as worshipping the Host of Heaven, Baalims; and the Gentiles other things beside them. But we shall not be long in doubt; the next words will clear the case, and tell us they shall be *Doctrines of Demons*, Διδασκαλίαι ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙ'ΩΝ, not, which Demons and Devils are authors of (though that be true), as if the genitive case had an active sense, but *doctrines concerning Demons*, the genitive case being here to be taken passively for the object of these doctrines, as in Heb. vi. 2, we have "doctrines of baptisms," and "doctrines of laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment," that is, doctrines about and concerning all these. And the same use may elsewhere be found with the word *doctrine*; as in Acts xiii. 12, *the doctrine of the Lord*, that is, concerning him. So Titus ii. 10* *the doctrine of God our Saviour*. And Gal. ii. 27, we have *the faith of the Son of God*, that is, concerning him. Similarly in my text, *Doctrines of Demons* are *Doctrines concerning Demons;* that is, the Gentiles' Idolatrous Theology of Demons should be revived among Christians. For I take the word *Demon* † not in that worst sense (which no Author but the Scripture useth), but in the better or more indifferent sense, as it was supposed and taken among the Theologists and Philosophers of the Gentiles, and as it is also sometimes taken in Scripture, as I shall shew in due time.

* διδασκαλία τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ.

† Δαιμόνιον, or Δαίμων.

CHAPTER III.

Demons (according to the Theology of the Gentiles) were—1. *For their nature and degree, a middle sort of divine powers between the sovereign gods and mortal men.*—2. *For their office they were supposed to be mediators and agents between the celestial gods and men.*—*This proved from* Plato, Plutarch, Apuleius, Celsus; *in* Origen, *and* St. Austin.—*The doctrine of the mediation of demons glanced at and reproved by the Apostle,*—*Colos.* ii. 8.—*The distinction of* sovereign gods *and* demons *proved out of the Old Testament, and elegantly alluded to in the New,*—1 *Cor.* viii. 5, 6.

MEANWHILE, let us first see what the Gentiles and their theologists understood by Demons; which when you have heard, I doubt not but you will confess the deifying and worshipping of saints and angels, with other parts of the idolatry of those who do this, to be as lively an image of the *doctrine of demons* as could possibly be expressed, and one whereby the apostasy of the latter times is, as by a character, distinguished from the heresies, false doctrines, and corruptions of all other times whatsoever.

Demons, in the Gentiles' theology, were *(Deastri)*, or an inferior sort of deified powers, as a middle between the sovereign Gods and mortal men. So says Plato, *(in Symposio;)* * so say all the Platonists, and well nigh all other sects of philosophers. I am sure the most do;

* Πᾶν τὸ Δαιμόνιον μέταξυ ἐστι Θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ.

for it is a very ancient doctrine, insomuch that Plutarch* fetcheth this distinction between sovereign Gods and demons, as far as the antiquity of Zoroaster.† "They seem to me" (saith he) "to have solved great and difficult doubts, who have placed the demons between the gods and men, and found out what, in some sort, uniteth and joineth us with them; whether this be the doctrine of the Magi and Zoroaster, or the Thracian doctrine derived from Orpheus, or the Egyptian, or Phrygian, &c." The sovereign or highest Gods, (which, amongst them, were properly called Gods,) were those whom they supposed to be in the heavens, yea, in the sun, moon, and stars, whence they called them "Gods above, celestial Gods,"‡ whom they affirmed to have neither beginning nor ending; as Apuleius, in his treatise *concerning the demon of Socrates*, "immortal, without any end or beginning, and altogether eternal."§ And because they dwelt, in the heavenly lights, as it were souls in bodies, Plato thinks that the name (*θεοὶ*) as if (*αει θεόντα*) first came in consequence

* De defectu oraculorum.

† Ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκοῦσι πλέιονας λῦσαι καὶ μέιζονας ἀπορίας ὁι τὸ Δαιμόνων γένος ἐν μέσῳ Θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τρόπον τινα τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῶν συνάγον εἰς ταυτὸ καὶ συνάπτον εξευρόντες· ἔιτε μάγων τῶν τε περὶ Ζωροάστρην ὁ λόγος ὗτός ἐστιν, ἔιτε Θρᾴκιος ἀπ' Ορφέως, ἔιτε Αἰγύπτιος, ἢ φρύγιος, &c.

‡ (Dii superi, Dii cœlestes.)

§ (Immortales sine ullo vel fine vel exordio, sed prorsus a retro æviterni.)

of the everlasting running and incessant motion of the heavenly bodies. (Cratyl. p. 397.)

Now, these sovereign and celestial Gods they supposed so sublime and pure, as might not be profaned with approach of earthly things, or with the care and managing of mortal men's business; and, therefore, they bring in that middle sort of divine powers which they call * *demons*, to be as mediators and agents between the sovereign Gods and mortal men. Thus, saith Plato, in his *Symposium*.† "God is not approached by men, but all commerce and intercourse between Gods and men is performed by the mediations of demons." Do you wish to see in what particular? ‡ "Demons," saith he, "are reporters and carriers from men to the Gods, and again from the Gods to men, of the supplications and prayers of the one, and of the injunctions and rewards of devotion from the other." And Apuleius in the place forequoted describes them thus:—§ "Demons are middle powers, by whom both our desires and merits pass unto the Gods; they are carriers

* Δαίμονες, or Δαιμόνια.

† Θεὸς ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μίγνυται, ἀλλά διά Δαιμονίων πᾶσά ἐστιν ἡ ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος Θεοῖς πρὸς ανθρώπους.

‡ Τὸ Δαιμόνιόν ἐστιν ἑρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον Θεοῖς τὸ παρ' ανθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ Θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν.

§ Mediæ potestates, per quas et desideria nostra et merita ad Deos commeant; inter terricolas cœlicolasque vectores, hinc precum, inde donorum, qui ultro citroque portant, hinc petitiones, inde suppetias, seu quidem utrinque interpretes et salutigeri.

between men on earth, and the Gods in heaven —hence of prayers, thence of gifts; they bring to and fro, hence petitions, thence supplies; or they are certain interpreters on both sides, and conveyers of recommendations." "For," saith he,* "it beseems not the majesty of the sovereign Gods to manage these things of themselves." Whence it is that Celsus in Origen terms his demons:—† "The Peers, Presidents, Lieutenants, and officers of the Most High God, who, being neglected, can do as much hurt as the peers and officers of the Persian or Roman Kings." Where note, by the way, that Celsus, as some others, did acknowledge but one sovereign God.

By reason of this office of mediation, Plutarch (in his *De defect. Orac.)* calls the order of demons, agreeably to the doctrines of Plato,‡ "the natures which interpret and minister," also "attendants, recorders, overseers of sacred rites and mysteries." To stay no longer here, take the sum of all in the words of Apuleius, in the book forenamed:—§ "All things are done by the will, power, and authority, of the celestial Gods; but withal by the service and ministry of the demons." If I should bring all that I might

* Neque enim pro majestate Deûm cœlestium fuerit hæc curare.

† Σατράπας τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεοῦ, καὶ ὑπάρκους, καὶ στρατήγους καὶ ἐπιτρόπους.—Or. Contra Cels., lib. viii.

‡ Τὴν ἑρμηνευτικὴν καὶ διακονικὴν φύσιν. Also, ὑπηρέτας, καὶ γραμματεῖς, ἐπισκόπους ἱέρων καὶ μυστηρίων.

§ Cuncta Cœlestium voluntate, numine, et authoritate fiunt, sed Dæmonum obsequio, opera et ministerio.

to this purpose, I should be too tedious. Porphyrius in Eusebius, and Plutarch, skilful men in this kind of philosophy, will satisfy them fully to whom this is not sufficient.

This was the philosophy that was universal in the apostles' times, and the times long before them. Thales, Pythagoras, all the Academics and Stoics, and not many to be excepted, unless the Epicureans, taught this divinity. He that had rather read a Father of the Church, let him but turn over the eighth and ninth books of St. Austin *De Civ. Dei*, the eighteenth chapter of the former book, having this title: *—"What a religion is it that teacheth men to use good demons for their advocates to commend them to the Gods?" The one-and-twentieth chapter this:†— "Whether the Gods do use demons for their messengers and interpreters." And of the ninth chapter of the ninth book, the title is this: ‡ —"Whether the friendship and favour of the celestial gods may be procured for men by the intercession of demons." And of the seventeenth chapter, this:—§"To the attaining of blessedness, man hath no need of a demon for his mediator, but of Christ alone." The reading of which titles alone were sufficient to shew what

* Qualis sit religio in qua docetur quò homines, ut commendentur Diis, bonis Dæmonibus uti debeant advocatis.

† An Dæmonibus nuntiis et interpretibus utantur.

‡ An amicitia cœlestium Deorum per intercessionem Dæmonum possit homini provideri.

§ Ad consequendam vitam beatam non tali mediatore indigere hominem qualis est Dæmon, sed tali qualis est unus Christus.

was the supposed office of the demons among the Gentiles.

This philosophy, therefore, so general, was that, without doubt, whereof St. Paul admonisheth the Colossians, to take heed lest they were spoiled with the vain deceit thereof, as being *after the traditions of men, and rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.* For some Christians, even then, under a pretence of humility, of not approaching too nearly and too boldly to God, would have brought in the worshipping of angels instead of this of demons. But St. Paul tells them, that as in Christ *dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily,* so that he needed no colleagues of mediation; so also were they *complete in him,* and needed, therefore, no agents besides him. *Let no man,* therefore (saith he), *beguile you of your reward through humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, and not holding the head.*

Neither is the holy Scripture ignorant of this distinction of sovereign gods and demons. The first whereof, the celestial and sovereign gods, whether visible or invisible, it calls *Tsaba hashamayim,* the *host of heaven.* The other sort it styleth by the name of *Baalim,* that is, *Domini,* or *Lords.* And Manasseh, that king of idolaters, was complete for both of them. So we read, 2 Chr. xxxiii. 3, that "he reared up altars for Baalim, and made groves, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them." And, 2 Kings xxiii. 5, that good Josiah is said to have

"put down the idolatrous priests which burnt incense to Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven." And, 2 Kings xvii. 16, the Israelites are said to have *worshipped all the host of heaven*, and to have *served Baal*. Now, that these Baalims were no other than demon-gods appears by their cutting and lancing themselves who worshipped them. *(a)* 1 Kings xviii. 28. For these tragic ceremonies are counted by those who treat about these mysteries as certain characters of demons. But this you shall have further confirmed in due place, where the arguments may be better understood.

This distinction, also, of sovereign Gods and demons, I suppose, our apostle alludes to, 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, where he saith,—"Though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth; as there be * *Gods many*," that is, *Dii cœlestes*, sovereign deities, "† and *Lords many*," that is, ‡ demons, presidents of earthly things, "yet to us" Christians "there is but one" sovereign "God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we to him," that is, to whom, as supreme, we are to direct all our services, "and but one Lord Jesus Christ," instead of their many mediators and demons, "by whom are all things" which come from the Father to us, and through whom alone we find access unto him. The allusion, methinks, is passing elegant, and such as, I think, cannot be well understood

* Θεοὶ πολλοὶ. † καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ.

‡ Δαίμονες ἐπιχθόνιοι.

without this distinction of superior and inferior deities in the theology of the Gentiles; they having a plurality in both sorts, and we Christians but one in each, as our apostle affirmeth. There wants but only the name of *demons*, instead of which the apostle puts *Lords*, and that for the honour of Christ, of whom he was to infer, *one Lord;* the name of Christ being not to be polluted with the appellation of an idol. For had he said, "there be Gods many, and demons many," to keep up the opposition, he would have been obliged to say, "to us, there is but one God, and *one demon." Or it may be he alludes unto the Hebrew name *Baalim*, which signifies *Lords;* and those *Lords*, as I told you, were nothing else but demons. For thus would St. Paul speak in the Hebrew tongue,—"There are (*Elohim Rabbim* and *Baalim rabbim*) *many Gods* and *many Lords.*"

* εἷς Δαίμων.

CHAPTER IV.

The Gentiles' doctrine concerning the original of demons—viz., that they were the souls of men deified, or canonized, after death.—This proved out of Hesiod, Plato, Trismegist, Philo Biblius, the translator of Sanchoniathon, Plutarch, Tully.—Baal, or Bel, or Belus, the first deified king; hence demons are called in Scripture, Baalim. Demons and heroes, how they differ. Demons called, by the Romans, Penates, Lares, as also Dii Animales, soul gods.—Another and a higher kind of demons, such as never dwelt in bodies: these answer to angels, as the other (viz. the soul demons) answer to saints.

AND thus I have shewed you, (though but briefly, in regard to the abundance the argument would afford,) the nature and office of these *demons*, according to the doctrine of the Gentiles. I come now unto another part of this doctrine, which concerns the original of demons, whom you shall find to be the SOULS OF MEN DEIFIED AFTER DEATH. For the canonizing of the souls of deceased worthies is not now first devised among Christians, but was an idolatrous trick, even from the days of the elder world; so that the Devil, when he brought in this apostatical doctrine amongst Christians, swerved but little from his ancient method of seducing mankind.

Let Hesiod speak in the first place, as being of the most known the most ancient. He tells us,

that* "when those happy men of the first and golden age of the world were departed this life, the great Jupiter promoted them to be demons; that is, keepers and protectors, or patrons of earthly mortals, and overseers of their good and evil works, givers of riches, &c., and this" saith he, "is the kingly royalty given them."

And hence it is that Oenomaus, quoted by Eusebius, calleth these demon-gods,† "Hesiod's Gods."

The next shall be Plato, who, in his *Cratylus*, says that Hesiod, and a great number of the rest of the poets, speak excellently, when they affirm that good men, when they die, attain great honour and dignity, and become demons (Δάιμονες), which is, saith he, as much as to say (Δαήμονες), *wise ones;* for *wise ones*, saith he, are only *good ones*, and all *good ones* are of Hesiod's golden generation.

The same Plato ‡ would have all those who die valiantly in the field "to be accounted of the golden kind," and § "to be made demons, and the Oracle to be consulted how they should be buried

* Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ μὲν τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψεν
Τοὶ μὲν ΔΑΊΜΟΝ'ΕΣ εἰσι Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς,
Ἐσθλοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
Οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσι δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
Ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι, πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' ἶαν
Πλουτοδόται· καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλήιον ἔσχον.

† Ἡσιοδέιοι θεοὶ.

‡ Lib. 5. de Repub.

§ Δαίμονας effici.

and honoured; and accordingly,* ever afterwards their sepulchres to be served and adored as the sepulchres of demons. In like manner should be done unto all who, in their life-time, excelled in virtue, whether they died through age or otherwise." This place Eusebius quotes, (Præp. Ev., bk. 13) to parallel with it the then harmless practice of Christians, in honouring the memory of martyrs, by holding their assemblies at their sepulchres; to the end that he might shew the Gentiles that Christians also honoured their worthies in the worthiest fashion. But it had been well if, in the next ages after, this custom of Christians (then but resembling) had not proved the very same *doctrine of demons* which the Gentiles practised.

But I go on, and my next author shall be Hermes Trismegistus, whose antiquity is said to be very near the time of Moses. I will translate you his words out of his *Asclepius*, which Apuleius translated into Latin. There, having named Æsculapius, Osiris, and his grandfather Hermes, who were, as he saith, worshipped for demons in his own time, he adds further, that the Egyptians call them (namely, the *demons*) *holy animals*,† and that amongst them (namely, the Egyptians),‡ "through every city, the souls

* ὡς Δαιμόνων ὄντω θεραπεύσομέν τε καὶ προσκυνήσομεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας.

† Sancta animalia.

‡ Per singulas civitates coli eorum animas, quorum sunt consecratæ virtutes.

of those are worshipped whose virtues are deified." And here note, by the way, that some are of opinion that the Egyptian *Serapis*, whose idol had a bushel upon his head, was *Joseph*, whose soul the Egyptians had canonized for a demon after his death.

Philo Byblius, the translator of Sanchoniathon, that ancient Phœnician historian, who lived before the times of Troy, and wrote the Acts of Moses and the Jews, saith Eusebius, very agreeably to the Scripture: and (saith he) learned his story of Jerom-baal, a priest of the God Jevo; Philo Byblius, I say, in a preface to his translation of this author, setteth down what he had observed and learned out of the same story, and might serve to help the understanding of those who should read it; namely, that all the barbarians, chiefly the Phœnicians and Egyptians, of whom the rest had it, accounted of those for the greatest gods (Dii maximi,) who had found out anything profitable for the life of men, or had deserved well of any nation; and that they worshipped these as Gods, erecting statues, images, and temples unto them. And more especially they gave the names of their Kings, as to the elements of the world, so also to these their reputed Gods; for they esteemed the natural deities of the sun, moon, and planets, and those which are in these, to be only and properly Gods; so that they had two sorts of Gods: some were immortals, and others were, as we may term them, mortalists.

Thus saith Philo Byblius, out of the Phœnician history; from which testimony we may borrow

some more light concerning those Baalims in Scripture. For Baal, or Belus, whose worship Jezebel, the daughter of Ithobaal, King of Tyre, brought into Israel, was a deified Phœnician King of that name, as Virgil will tell us, in the verse concerning the Phœnician Queen Dido.* "She filled with wine the bowl, which Belus and all her ancestors since Belus used." *(b)*

Nay, Baal, or, in the Chaldee dialect, Bel, (for all is one,) was the first King of Babel after Nimrod; and the first, as it is written, that ever was deified, and reputed a God after death; whence afterwards they called all other demons Baalim, even as because the first Roman Emperor was called Cæsar, thence were all the Emperors after him styled *Cæsars. (c)* And it may be that this is part of that which Philo Byblius, out of Sanchoniathon, would tell us, that the barbarians, especially the Phœnicians, &c., gave names from their Kings to such as were canonized after death. For so we see here, that the Babylonians, and the neighbouring countries, which spoke the Hebrew tongue, or some dialect thereof, called all demons Baalim, from the first demon or deified King in the world, Baal or Belus. For at the time when Belus reigned in Babel, Phœnicia, with the neighbouring people, was under the kingdom of Babel, whence may seem also to have come their community of language and ceremonies. And here note a wonderful mystery—that old Babel, the first

* Implevitque mero pateram quam Belus et omnes
A Belo soliti.

pattern in the world of ambitious dominion, was also the foundress of idols,* and the mother of the fornication and abominations of the earth.

And because we have fallen upon the naming of demons, let us observe another mystery of names, out of Plutarch (De defect. Orac.) which may help us out of, or prevent some difficulties, namely, that "demons are sometimes called by the names of those celestial gods whose ministers and proctors they are, and from whom they receive their power and divinity; as Apollo's demon, *Apollo;* Jupiter's demon, *Jupiter;* and so the rest." † To which is agreeable what Eusebius ‡ quotes out of Diodorus, viz., that "the Egyptians affirmed such as had been great benefactors when they lived, to be deified after their death, and some of these to be called by the very names of the celestial gods."

The same Plutarch in the same place doth acquaint us with this pretty conceit, which being to the purpose, I will not omit; namely, that the souls of men took degrees after death; first they commenced heroes who were as probationers to a demonship; then after a suitable time demons; and after that, if they deserve well, to a more sublime degree. Howsoever it be, demons and heroes differed but in more and less antiquity;

* Jer. i. 38. Is. xlvii. 12.

† ᾧ γὰρ ἕκαστος θεῷ συντέτακται, καὶ παρ' ὃν δυνάμεως καὶ τιμῆς ἔλαχεν, ἀπὸ τοῦτο φιλεῖ καλεῖσθαι·

‡ Præpar. Evang. lib. iii. cap. 3.

the more ancient *heroes* being called *demons*, and the younger demons, *heroes*.

But that we may return again closer to the matter in hand, this order of demons, or soul-gods, as I may call them, found place in the religion of the elder Romans, who called them Penates, Lares, and Manii Dii; and when once they began to canonize their deceased Emperors, which was from the time of Augustus, they called them *divi*, or *gods*, which word before that time was more general. Tully in his second book *De Legibus*, shall be my witness, that his countrymen acknowledged this distinction of sovereign gods, and soul-deified powers; for there you shall find this law.* "Let them worship the gods; both those who were ever accounted celestial, and those whom their own merits have advanced to heaven." And again,† "let the rights of separate souls be kept inviolable, and let them account the deceased worthies as gods." Would God the present Christian Romans had not renewed this law.

Yea so strongly was this doctrine embraced amongst the Gentiles, that some of their latter theologists thought that even the souls of wicked men and tyrants had a power after death, and that of these came evil demons‡ which hurt

* Divos, et eos qui Cœlestes semper habiti, colunto : et illos quos in cœlum merita vocaverint.

† Deorum manium jura sancta sunto. Hos letho datos Dios habento.

‡ Mali demones.

men; and yet to these they ordained temples and sacrifices to keep them from hurting them, as well as to the good demons for helping them. But the ancients gave this honour to the souls of virtuous men only.

Thus have you heard the original of demons according to the ancient and general opinion of the Gentiles. But besides these demons whose original you have heard, (I mean besides soul-demons and canonized mortals,) their theologists bring in another kind of demons more high and sublime, which never had been the souls of men, nor ever were linked to a mortal body, but were from the beginning, or without beginning, always the same. (d) So Apuleius tells us in his book *on the God of Socrates*, saying,* "there is another and a higher kind of demons, who having been ever free from the bonds and ties of the body, may be regarded as peculiar powers. Plato thinks, that from these more exalted demons men are supplied with witnesses and guardians." This sort of demons doth fitly answer and parallel that sort of spiritual powers which we call angels, as the former of soul-demons those which, with Roman Catholics, are called saints.

* Est et superius aliud augustiusque Dæmonum genus, qui semper a corporis compedibus et nexibus liberi, certis potestatibus procurentur. Ex hac sublimiori Dæmonum copia autumat Plato singulis hominibus in vita agenda testes et custodes singulos additos.

CHAPTER V.

The manner and way of worshipping the demons, and retaining their presence, viz. by consecrated images and pillars.—That images were as bodies for demons to animate and dwell in.—The worshipping of images and columns a piece of the doctrine of demons.—*This proved out of* Trismegist, Porphyry, Arnobius, Minutius Felix, *&c.—The worshipping of demons in their reliques, shrines, and sepulchres, another piece of demon-doctrine.—That the Gentiles' temples were nothing but the sepulchres of dead men.—The gross idolatry of the Egyptians.*

But lest I might seem to have no measure in raking up this Ethnical dunghill, I will now leave the theology of the origin of demons, and shew you yet another piece of that doctrine, namely, concerning the manner how demons were to be worshipped, and as it were brought to the lure of men, when they had occasion of devotion with them; and this was done by *consecrating of images.* (e) This you shall hear from an ancient author, and passing skilful in the mysteries, even Hermes Trismegistus, who in his *Asclepius* speaketh, in English thus: "It is a wonder," saith he, "beyond all wonders," and he saith truly, "that man should find out a way to make Gods; yet because," saith he, "our forefathers erred much through unbelief concerning deities, and had small regard of religion and divine worship; therefore they devised an art to make Gods," he meaneth images, "and because they could

not *make* souls," he means to these senseless bodies, "therefore they called the souls of demons and angels, and put them into their images and holy mysteries; by which means alone these images have power of helping and hurting; which thus incorporated," he saith, "are called by the Egyptians, *holy animals*." And in another place, "That kind of gods," saith he, "which men make, is composed of two natures, of a Divine, which is first and more sacred, and of that which is amongst men, namely, the matter whereof they are made." The sum of all this mystery is, that images were made as bodies, to be informed with demons as with souls; for an image was as a trap to catch demons; and a device to tie them to a place, and to keep them from flitting.

The like hath Eusebius out of Porphyry. (Præp. l. 5.) "That the gods did exceedingly delight in consecrated images, and were circumscribed and enclosed therein as in a sacred place;* and the image being taken away, that is dissolved which detained the Deity upon earth." This is that which Psellus † calleth "the approachings or presencings of demons." And Jamblichus termeth these consecrated idols,‡ "images filled with Divine fellowship," or "with Divine society." And our forementioned Hermes calleth them § "animated statues, full of sense and spirit."

* ἧς ἀρθείσης, λελυται τὸ κρατοῦν ἐπὶ γῆς τὸ θεῖον.
† προσεγγίσεις δαιμονίων.
‡ Ἀγάλματα θείας μετουσίας ἀνάπλεα.
§ Statuas animatas, sensu et spiritu plenas.

Hence came that answer or defence of the Gentiles, as Arnobius makes them speak:* "We do not think brass, and gold, and silver, and other materials of images, to be of themselves Gods and holy powers; but in these we worship and reverence the Gods brought into these images by sacred dedication, and keeping their residence there." And in another place he makes this objection for their behalf; † "But you say, perhaps, the deities present themselves unto you in some sort under these images: and because the Gods cannot be seen, they are thus worshipped and have religious service done unto them."

And thus have we seen the ground of the idolatrous use of images, and found that the worship of them also is a *doctrine of demons;* for as at first they were ordained for demons; so whatsoever Deity is worshipped in this manner, though it were the true and sovereign God, is thereby made a demon.

What I say of images must be understood also of pillars and columns, whereof we read, Levit. xxvi. 1, *Ye shall make no idols, nor graven images, nor rear you up a pillar to bow down unto*

* Lib. vi. advers. Gent. 'Neque nos æra, neque auri argentique materias, neque alias quibus signa confiunt eas esse per se Deos et religiosa decernimus numina; sed eos in his colimus, eosque veneramur quos dedicatio infert sacra, et fabrilibus efficit habitare simulachris.

† An numquid dicitis forte præsentiam vobis quandam sub his numinum exhiberi simulachris; et, quia Deos videri non datum est, eos ita coli, et iis munia officiosa præstari?

it. For however pillars and images, through some confusion at length surprising the Gentiles' superstition, may afterwards seem to be ascribed to other Deities besides demons, yet by original institution they were proper unto demons, and to no other. The sovereign and celestial Gods were worshipped in the sun, moon, and stars, where they were supposed to dwell; but images and columns were for demons; and if they seemed to be made for any other, Plutarch's Eremite would resolve us that they were but demons called by the name of some sovereign gods whose agents they were. The truth of this the history of the beginning of idolatry by images makes evident. For that images and pillars were at first devised and erected to the honour and memory of dead men, this the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Wisdom will tell us, and that "by the vain glory of men they first entered into the world." No less will the long-continuing custom of the world, using thus to honour not only their *dead*, but since also the *living*, be sufficient to persuade the truth. Minutius Felix, in his *Octavius*, will put us out of doubt.* "Our ancestors," saith he, "while they religiously honour their kings, while they desire after their departure to behold them in their images, and delight to preserve their memory in statues; what was at first taken up for their own solace, was at length

* Majores nostri, dum reges suos colunt religiose, dum defunctos eos desiderant in imaginibus videre, dum gestiunt eorum memorias in statuis detinere; sacra facta sunt, quæ fuerant assumpta solatia.

made a matter of religion." When, therefore, those whom they thus honoured and remembered were canonized as demons, then were these memorials also worshipped for some supposed presence or Divine respect of such demons in or to them. The worshipping, therefore, of images and columns is, by its original and institution, a piece of the *doctrine of demons;* so that whatsoever is thus worshipped, yea, the glory of the incorruptible God himself, is thereby changed into a demon. (g)

Thus much of images and idol-pillars, of the reason of their supposed divinity, and of the original and first occasion of worshipping them. But yet we have not done; there is another piece of demon-devotion yet behind, viz., the worshipping of demons in their reliques, shrines, and sepulchres; for this was also a part of the doctrine and theology of demons. (h) Plato, whom before we quoted, upon the canonizing, for demons, of the ghosts of such as died valiantly in the field, would have their shrines and coffins to be worshipped, (*ὡς Δαιμόνων θήκας*) "as the coffins of demons." Hear also what Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of this demon-doctrine.* "They," that is the Greeks, "are of opinion that it matters not whether we call those souls," viz., the demons whom they invocate, "gods or angels. But the more skilful theologists place the coffins of the deceased in many of their temples as so

* Strom. lib. vi. *Διαφέρειν δ' οὐδὲν νομίζουσιν ἐὰν γ' οὖν θεοὺς, εἴτε καὶ ἀγγέλους τὰς ψυχὰς τάντας λέγοιμεν.*

many statues of the gods*, calling their souls demons, and withal teaching that they ought to be worshipped by men, as being for the holiness of their lives intrusted by Divine Providence to be employed about this earth for the service of men; for they well knew that some souls were naturally tied to the body." Out of which words observe, that they supposed the like presence and power of demons at their coffins and sepulchres which before we observed and heard of in their images: as though there always remained some natural tie between the souls deceased and their reliques; and therefore they there builded temples unto them where their bodies and ashes were entombed. And hence it is that the primitive Fathers which write against the Gentiles do so often upbraid them. "That their temples were nothing else but the sepulchres of dead men;" "† they were indeed called by the specious and plausible name of temples, but were in truth nothing but sepulchres; that is, the very sepulchres of dead men were called temples." He goeth on speaking to the Gentiles; "‡ Be ye, therefore, at length persuaded to forget and relinquish your demon-worship, and be ashamed to worship the sepulchres of dead men." To the like purpose Arnobius, lib. vi. advers. Gent.,

* Δαίμονας μὲν τὰς τούτων ψυχὰς καλοῦντες, θρησκέυεσθαι δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων διδάσκοντες.

† Νεὼς μὲν ἐνφήμως ὀνομαζομένους, τάφους δὲ γενομένους, τουτέστι, τοὺς τάφους νεὼς ἐπικεκλημένους.

‡ Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀλλὰ καί νῦν δεισιδαιμονίας ἐκλάθεσθε, τούς τάφους τιμῶν αἰσχυνόμενοι.

where he tells them * that many of their temples, famous for their high and golden roofs, were nothing but the sepulchres of the deceased, covering dead bones and ashes; and that it was very evident that for the immortal gods they worshipped men that were dead, or that they were guilty of doing a horrible dishonour to the gods, whose temples were built over the burying-places of dead men.

I might further add to these universal doctrines of demons that monstrous one of the Egyptians, for which their fellow Gentiles derided them; who worshipped *living brute beasts*, yea *onions*, and *garlick*, and *water* itself, with divine worship, as supposing some demon or other to dwell in them. Such were their cow-god *Apis*, their bull-god *Mnevis*, and their water-god *Nilus*, which it shall be enough to have only named, to make the former complete; and that from it and the rest of that kind of abominations we may gather this conclusion once for all, That since the sovereign and celestial gods, as you heard before, might not be approached nor polluted by these earthly and material things, but kept always immoveably, without change of place or presence, their heavenly stations; therefore

* Quid quod multa ex his templa quæ tholis sunt aureis et sublimibus elata fastigiis, auctorum conscriptionibus comprobantur contegere cineres atque ossa, et functorum esse corporum sepulturas? Nonne patet et promptum est aut pro diis immortalibus mortuos vos colere, aut inexpiabilem fieri numinibus contumeliam, quorum delubra et templa mortuorum superlata sunt bustis?

the adoring or worshipping of any visible or material thing for any supposed presence or other relation of a Divine power therewith, is to be accounted amongst the doctrines of demons.

CHAPTER VI.

A recapitulation or summary of the doctrines of demons.—How the severals thereof are revived and resembled in the apostate Christian Church.—That the word demon * *is sometimes in Scripture taken according to the Theology of the Gentiles, and not always for an evil spirit.—That it is so to be taken in the text was the judgment of* Epiphanius; *an observable passage quoted out of him to this purpose.*

And thus have you seen the theology of demons; 1st, for their nature and degree, to have been supposed by the Gentiles an inferior and middle sort of divine powers between the sovereign and heavenly gods and mortal men. 2. Their office to be as mediators and agents between these sovereign gods and men. 3. Their original, to be the deified souls of worthy men after death; and some of a higher degree, which had no beginning, nor ever were imprisoned in mortal bodies. 4. The way to worship them, to find and receive benefits from them; namely, by consecrated images and pillars, wherein to have and retain their presence at devotions to be given them. 5. To adore their relics, and to temple them.

Now, therefore, judge impartially whether St. Paul's prophecy be not fulfilled already amongst Christians, who foretold that the time should come that they should apostatize, and

* Δαιμονιον.

revive again * *doctrines of demons;* whether the deifying and worshipping of saints and angels, whether the bowing down to images, whether of men or other things visible, breaden idols, and crosses like new demon pillars, whether the adoring or templing of relics, whether these make not as lively an image of the Gentiles' theology of demons as possibly could be expressed, and whether these two words comprehend not the whole pith and marrow of *Christian apostasy*, which was to consist in spiritual fornication or idolatry; as appears by that name and denomination given by St. John in his Revelation, the *whore of Babylon.* Is she not rightly termed the Babylonish harlot, which hath revived and replanted the doctrines of demons first founded in the ancient Babel? And is not this now fulfilled which St. John foretells us, Rev. xi. That the second and outmost court of the Temple, which is the second state of the Christian Church, together with the holy city, should be trodden down and overtrampled by the Gentiles, that is, overwhelmed with the Gentiles' idolatry, forty-two months?

But, perhaps, I am yet too forward in my application; some things in our way must first be cleared. For howsoever the resemblance indeed be evident, yet, *first*, the text seems not to intend or mean it, because the word *Demon* is in the Scripture never taken in the better or indifferent sense, howsoever profane authors do so use it, but always in an evil sense, for *the devil*, or an

* Διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων.

evil spirit. Now the signification of words in Scripture is to be esteemed and taken only according to the Scripture use, though other writers use them otherwise. *Secondly*, for the charge of Idolatry; though much of that wherein we have instanced may be granted to be justly suspected for such indeed, yet, nevertheless, that whereupon this application mainly relieth, namely, the praying to saints glorified, as mediators and agents for us with God, should not seem to deserve so foul a name. For suppose it were a needless, yea a fruitless ceremony, yet what reason can be given why this should be more tainted with idolatry, than is the like honour given to saints and holy men whilst they live on earth, whom then to desire to mediate and pray to God for us was never accounted so much as an unlawful matter? When these two scruples are answered, I will return to continue my former application.

To the first, therefore, for the use of the word *demon* in Scripture, I say, That because those which the Gentiles took for demons and deified souls of their worthies, were indeed no other than evil spirits, counterfeiting the souls of men deceased, and masking themselves under the names of such supposed demons, under that colour to seduce mankind; therefore the Scripture useth the name *demons*, for what they were, indeed, and not for what they seemed to be. For no blessed soul or good angel would admit any honour which did derogate from the honour of the only true God who made them: neither do the glorified saints in heaven,

or the blessed angels, though apostate Christians now invocate and worship them, accept of this honour, hear their prayers, or condescend to their devotions, by any sign or act whatsoever; but whatsoever is made seem to be done by them, is done by the self-same wicked spirits which heretofore were masked under the names of demons; and, therefore, on this account, the one may as well bear the name of demons as the other, and be as likely to be intended by the use of that word.

Secondly, though the Scripture often uses this word in the worst sense, yet follows it not that it would always do so; because the word *devil** itself, which the Scripture hath appropriated to signify Satan the Prince of hell-hounds, following therein the Seventy, who first gave it this notion, nowhere else sampled in any Greek author,—yet is this word *devil* in the New Testament itself† three several times used in the common sense for a *slanderer* or *false accuser*, and that in three several epistles, in both those to Timothy, and in that to Titus. And why should the like seem improbable for the word *demon*.‡ Nay, most certain it is so, as I now come to make manifest.

And that comes first, Acts xvii. 18, where St. Paul, our apostle, having at Athens preached Jesus risen from the dead, the philosophers thus encountered him, saying, Ξένων δαιμόνιων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, which we translate, "This fellow seemeth to be a setter forth of

* Διάβολος. † 1 Tim. iii. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 3. Tit. ii. 3.
‡ Δαίμων, or Δαιμόνιον.

strange gods," namely, demon-gods. For hearing of one Jesus after death, to become a Lord and Saviour, and to be adored with Divine worship, they took him presently (according to their own principles in that kind) to be some new or foreign demon; for so it follows in the text, that they said thus, *because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection.* Upon the same ground *Celsus,* in *Orig.*, b. 8, calls the same Christ our Saviour the Christians' demon; for whereas the Christians said that they without hurt and danger blasphemed and reproached the Gentiles' gods, Celsus replies,* "Do you not see, good Sir, that some opposing your demon, do not only reproach him, but proclaim him unworthy to be at all in the world." Where *Origen* answers *Celsus,*† "He that acknowledges no evil demons, I know not how he came to forget himself calling Jesus a demon." But St. Paul thus charged by the philosophers, coming to make his apology in the *Areopagus,* retorts their accusation: "Ye men of Athens," saith he, "I see you in all things too full of demons already;" I shall not need to bring any more amongst you. (For thus the word Δεισιδαιμων by etymology signifies "a worshipper of Demon-gods," and was anciently used in this sense;

'Ουχ ὁρᾷς οὖν, ὦ βέλτιστε, ὅτι καὶ τὸν σὸν δαίμονα καταστάς τις, οὐ βλασφημεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἐκκηρύττει;

κατὰ δὲ Κελσον μήδεν ἐμφήναντα περὶ φάυλων δαιμόνων, οὐκ διὸ ὅπως ἐπιλαθόμενον ἑαυτοῦ, δαίμοῦ ὁ 'Ιησοῦς εἴρηται.

and so you shall find it often in * *Clemens Alexandrinus*, his Protrepticon, not to speak of others; though afterwards, from signifying reverence toward the Divinity, as *Budæus* speaks, it came to be applied to those who were too precise and anxious in their devotions.) But I, saith our apostle, preach no new demon to you, but that sovereign and celestial *God who made the world and all things therein:* who, *being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not*, as your Demon-gods do, *in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything*, as you conceive of your Demons, *seeing he giveth to all, life and breath and all things:* this God I preach unto you." And this place I take to be so unanswerable for the indifferent and common acceptation of the word *Demon* that I care not now though the rest should fail me; but let us see what they are.

In Revelation ix. 13, &c., the sixth trumpet from *Euphrates* brings a huge army upon the Christian world, which destroyeth a third part of men; and yet those which remained *repented not* of those sins (verse 20) for which these plagues

* Et strom. l. vii. p. 504. Δεισιδαίμων ὁ δεδιὼς τὰ δαιμόνια. Lactantius lib. iv. Inst. Div. sit. Superstitiosi vocantur aut ii qui superstitem memoriam defunctorum colunt; aut qui parentibus suis superstites celebrant imagines eorum domi, tanquam Deos penates. Nam qui novos sibi ritus assumebant, ut Deorum vice mortuos honorarent, quos ex hominibus in Cœlum receptos putabant hos superstitiosos vocabant: eos vero qui publicos et antiquos Deos colerent religiosos nominabant; unde Virgilius, vana superstitio veterumque ignara Deorum.

came upon the earth, viz. *that they should not worship demons, and idols of gold, silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk.* Is not this a comment upon the apostle's prophecy in my text? The *time* which it concerns must needs fall in the *last times;* for it is the last trumpet save one. The *place* must be the Roman Empire, or Christian world; for that is the stage of all the seals and trumpets. And how could it be otherwise, seeing St. John at Patmos saw them coming from the great river Euphrates? whatsoever comes from thence must needs fall upon the territory of the *Roman* Empire. To detain you no longer, the best expounders make it the *Ottoman* or *Turkish* invasion, which hath swallowed so great a part of Christendom. But what people are they who in the Roman territory do in these latter times *worship idols of gold, silver, brass, and stone and wood;* Are they Heathens? There are none such. Are they Jews? They cannot endure the sight of them. Are they Mahometans? Nay, they abhor it also. Then must they needs be *Christians;* and then must Christians, too, worship *demons;* for both are spoken of the same men. But what Christians do, or ever did worship *Devils formally?* But demon-gods, alas! they do and long have done. Here, therefore, *Demon* is again taken in the common and philosophical sense, or, at least, which is all one, for *Evil Spirits* worshipped under the names of demons and deceased souls.

Besides my text, there is but one place more

in all the Epistles of *St. Paul*, where the word *Demon* is used, namely, 1 Cor. x. 21, where if there be any allusion to the Gentiles' conceit of demons, then all the places of St. Paul's Epistles are bending that way. But some there are, saith *Stephen* in his *Thesaurus*, who think the apostle in his *cup of demons*, alludes unto that* "cup of the good demon," used among the Gentiles. And further to strengthen this conceit of the Apostle's allusion to the heathenish notion of *demons*, the words of the former verse make much; for *the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice*, saith he, *to demons and not to God.* Now this was the very tenet of the Gentiles, that the sovereign and celestial Gods were to be worshipped only with the spirit, and with hymns and praises, and that sacrifices were only for demons. (See Porphyr. in Euseb. Præp. Evang. Herm. Trismeg. in Asclepio, Apuleium de Demonio Socratis.) He, therefore, who had given his faith to that *one Lord*, to the *only Potentate*, to *the one and only Mediator Jesus Christ*, must have no communion, have no part in the service of those many *Mediators, Lords,* or *demon Gods* of the nations; for Christ's monarchical Mediation excludes all other mediators and demons; not that the wooden idol was ought of itself, but that the Gentiles supposed there dwelt some demon therein, who received their sacrifices, and to whom they intended their services. Thus may this place be expounded, and so the use of the word *demon* in the worst sense, or directly for

* Poculum αγαθον Δαιμονος.

a Devil, will be almost confined to the Gospel; where the subject spoken of being men vexed with evil spirits, could admit no other sense or use; and yet St. Luke, the best languaged of the evangelists, knowing the word to be ambiguous, and therefore, as it were, to distinguish it once for all, doth the first time he useth it, do it with an explication, chap. iv. verse 33, "There was," saith he, "a man in the synagogue, * having the spirit of an unclean demon."

Thus much of the word *demon* in Scripture; whereby, I hope, it appears that this place of my text is not the only place where the word is used according to the notion of Gentiles and their theologists.

But you will say, Did any of the Fathers or ancients expound it thus in this place? If they had done so the *Mystery of Iniquity* could never have taken such footing; which because it was to come according to Divine disposition, what wonder, then, if this were hidden from their eyes? Howsoever it may seem that God left not his Spirit without a witness; for, as I take it, Epiphanius, one of the most zealous of the Fathers of his time against *saint worship* then peeping, took the *doctrines of demons*, in my text, for *a doctrine of worshipping dead men*. You may read him in the seventy-eighth heresy towards the conclusion, where, upon occasion of some who made a Goddess of the blessed Virgin, and offered a cake unto her as the Queen of Heaven, he quotes this place of my text con-

* ἔχων πνεῦμα Δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου.

cerning them, saying,* "That also of the apostle is fulfilled in these; some shall apostatize from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of demons; for, saith he, they shall be worshippers of dead men, as they were worshipped in Israel." Are not these last words an exposition of the *doctrines of demons?* But what, you will say, doth he mean by *the dead* worshipped in Israel? I suppose he means their *Baalim*, who, as is already shewn, were nothing else but demons or deified ghosts of men deceased. Yet he brings in two examples besides; one of the *Sichemites* in his time, who had a Goddess or Demoness under the name of *Jephtha's daughter;* another of the *Egyptians*, who worshipped *Thermutis*, that daughter of Pharaoh, which brought up Moses. Some, as *Beza*, would have these words of *Epiphanius* to be a part of the text itself, in some copy which he used. But how is that likely, when no other Father once mentions any such reading? Nay it appears, moreover, that *Epiphanius* intended to explain the words as he quoted them, as he doth * *the faith*, by † "the sound doctrine," and ‡ *erroneous spirits*, by § "fables," and so || "*giving heed to doctrines of demons*" by ¶ "worshipping dead men." Otherwise we must say he used

† πληροῦται γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτους τό, Ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς ὑγιέος διδασκαλίας, προσέχοντες μύθοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις Δαιμονιών· ἔσονται γάρ, φησὶ, ΝΕΚΡΟΙΣ λατρεύοντες, ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ισράηλ ἐσεβάσθησαν.

* πίστις. † ὑγίης διδασκάλια. ‡ πνεύματα πλάνης.
§ μύθοι. || προσέχοντες διδασκαλίαις Δαιμονίων.
¶ λατρεύοντες τοῖς νέκροις.

either a very corrupt copy, or quoted very carelessly. But grant that *Epiphanius* read so: either this reading was true, and so I have enough: because then the apostle with his "they shall be worshippers, &c.," should expound himself by *Demons* to mean the deifying of the dead: or it was not the original reading, but added by some one or other for explication; and so it will follow, that those who did it made no question but that the words there contained some such thing as *worshipping of the dead.* Therefore take it which way you will, it will follow that some such matter as we speak of was in times past supposed to be in this text and prophecy.

CHAPTER VII.

Why those words in the description of the mystery of godliness, received into glory, *are set last.—That praying to saints glorified, as mediators and agents for us with God, is Idolatry.—For the proof of this several grounds are laid down.—To be prayed to "in heaven," to present our devotions to God, and to deal as an agent and mediator between us and him, is a prerogative appropriate to Christ, a flower of his glory, and exaltation to sit at God's right hand, a royalty incommunicable to any other.—That none but Christ, our High Priest, is to be an agent for us with God in the heavens, was figured under the law, in that the high priest alone had to do in the most holy place, and there was to be agent for the people.—That though Christ, in regard of his person, was capable of this god-like glory and royalty, yet it was the will of God that he should purchase it by suffering an unimitable death.—This proved from several testimonies of Scripture.—Saint worship is a denial of Christ's prerogative.—Bread worship in the Eucharist, to what kind of Idolatry it may be reduced.—How saint worship crept into the Church.*

Now I come to the second point, to maintain and prove that praying to saints glorified, as mediators and agents for us with God, is justly charged with idolatry.

For this is the hinge whereupon not only the application of my text, but its interpretation, chiefly turneth. For I told you in the beginning, that my text depended upon the last words of the former chapter and verse, *received into glory;* which were, therefore, out of their due order, put in the last place, because my text was imme-

diately to be inferred upon them. The like misplacing, and for the like reason, see in Heb. xii. 23, where in a catalogue or recension of the parts of the Church "Christ the head," and "the sprinkling of his blood" is mentioned in the last place, and after the "spirits of just men," because the next verses are continued upon this sprinkling of Christ's blood: "ye are come to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel;" whereas the right order would have been, first, "God the judge of all;" secondly, "Christ the mediator of the new covenant;" and thirdly, in the last place, "the spirits of just men made perfect." See also Rev. i. 5, where Christ is named after the seven spirits for the like reason. Agreeably, therefore, to this dependance of my text, I am to shew, that the invocation of saints glorified implies an apostasy from Christ, and a denial of his glory and majesty, whereunto he is installed by his assumption into heaven, to sit at the right hand of God. Which before I do, I must premise some general grounds, as followeth.

First, that as God is One, and without all multiplicity, so must the honour and service which is given unto him have no communicability. Isaiah xlii. 8. *I am the* LORD, *that is my name, and my glory will I not give unto another, nor my praise to graven images;* for the one-most

God must have an one-most service. Therefore in that action whereof God is the object, nothing must be an object but God. Or, in the Scripture phrase, thus,—in those actions which look towards the "face of God," nothing may come between, whose face such actions may look upon besides him; whether by way of subordination to him, or representation of him; for *I am the Lord thy God*, saith he, *thou shalt have no other Gods before my face.* (Ex. xx., 3.)

Secondly, this face of God is not only the "object of his person," but also the "place of his presence," where his glory is revealed in the heavens, where *we shall see him face to face*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, Rev. xxii. 4, and where *the angels in heaven behold the face of the Father which is in heaven.* (Matt. xviii. 10.) No action therefore directed thitherward, that is, to this face of His revealed presence and glory, may so much as look asquint upon any other object, or behold any other face but the face of God alone; for we must have *no other Gods before his face.*

I say not, that a man may not turn his face upon the face of any other thing when he turns his face towards the face of God; for how then should we worship him at all, seeing which way soever we turn us, something will always be before us? But it is not the face of our bodies, or their posture, but the face and posture of *the act* we do, which must not have the face turned upon anything else, when it is directed at the face of God. That action in which God is faced,

must face nothing else but God; that is, where God is the object, whether in regard of his person, when we pray unto him, or of his throne of presence, when we would approach it, or direct our supplications towards it: *there* nothing is to be respected as the object but God alone. So although when we pray unto God we turn the face of our bodies towards heaven, the sun, the moon, and stars; yet we do not therefore worship the host of heaven, because our action hath no relation to them as to an object, but to God alone; and howsoever they are between God and us in place, yet as an object of our devotion neither they, nor anything in them, come any way between us and him.

Now for the reason, if you ask it, of this incommunicableness of all actions and services directed to God-ward, you shall have it, (Exod. xxxiv. 14.)—*Because the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God;* jealous not only lest he should not be honoured and served as *God;* but jealous lest he should not be honoured as *one God.* For as by honouring him we acknowledge him to be *God,* so by the incommunicableness of honour we acknowledge him to be *one God.*

For this cause, God being to give us a Mediator, by whom we should have access unto his presence, and whom, without His jealousy, we might interpose in our devotions and supplications unto Himself, offered at the Throne of his Majesty and Glory in the heavens, provided that

admirable mystery of communicating to the nature of a man born of a woman the hypostatical union of the Second Person of the Deity; and him, after he had vanquished death, exalted to *sit at his right hand* of glory and power in the heavens, there in his own Presence and Throne to receive our requests, and to deal as an agent between us and Him.

Thus at length I am arrived at that port which all this while I made for, viz., to shew, that this glory of Christ, which is styled his sitting at the right hand of God, is that incommunicable royalty to which of right it belongeth, in the presence of God, to receive and present our devotions to the Divine Majesty; as in that which now followeth shall appear.

To sit at the right hand of God, is to be installed in God's throne, or to have a God-like royalty, which is defined in Scripture,—*the majesty of Christ in heaven.* Whence it is said, Heb. i. 3, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοις, "he sat down on the right hand of Majesty on high;" and Heb. viii. 1, it is called Δεξιὰ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοις, "the right hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the Heavens:" it is also called by Christ himself, Mark xiv. 62, Δεξιὰ τῆς δυνάμεως, Luke xxii. 69, Δεξιὰ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, the right hand of Power, and the right hand of the Power of God: for as to the right hand belongs both dignity and strength; so doth this glory of Christ include both a God-like sublimity and a God-like power; the first, the right hand of the throne, δεξιὰ τοῦ

θρόνου, the second, the right hand of power, δεξιὰ τῆς δυνάμεως. The proper place where the majestical glory is revealed, is the heavens, as may appear almost wheresoever this sitting at the right hand of God is mentioned. Eph. i. 20, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. Coloss. iii. 1, ἐν τοῖς ἄνω Heb. i. 3. ἐν ὑψήλοις, Heb. vii. 26, ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐράνων, 1 Pet. iii. 22, εἰς οὐρανον, &c. Heaven, heavenly places, high places, and the like, being always thereto annexed: and everywhere appeareth to be a consequent of his ascension into heaven, as we say in our Creed, he ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God; and, therefore, in the words whereon my text depends, is expressed by, assumed or taken up into glory, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ. For as God himself is styled the Father in heaven, not because not elsewhere, but because his glory is there revealed: so Christ sits at the right hand in heaven, because there the beams of the Majesty given him by his Father are revealed: whence it comes that his kingdom is called the kingdom of Heaven, that is, a kingdom whose king's residence and kingly throne are both in Heaven.

This glorious Throne of Majesty, this *sitting at the right hand* of the power of the Almighty, is a name *incommunicable*, an exaltation whereof no creature in heaven or earth is capable: which is what the apostle means to tell us, when he saith, Eph. i. 21, *Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come;* " and Phil. ii. 9, 10,

Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name that is, created name, *that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, both of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;* (Rev. iii. 21.) *He that overcometh,* saith Christ, *I will give him to sit with me in my throne; even as I have overcome, and sat with my Father in his throne.* Here is mention, we see, of two thrones, of which, *my throne,* that is, Christ's throne, is the condition of a glorified man; in this throne his saints shall sit with him; but *my Father's throne* is the power of Divine Majesty, wherein none may sit but God, and the God-man Jesus Christ.

These grounds laid, I say,—that the honour of being prayed to in heaven, and before the Throne of presence, is a prerogative of *the right hand of God;* and to receive our devotions there, a flower of Christ's *sitting at the right hand of God*: as St. Paul, Rom. viii. 34, conjoins them, saying, *Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is at the right hand of God, and who makes intercession for us.* For by right of this his exaltation and majesty, he comes to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, as appears Psalm cx. 1. THE LORD *said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool;* then follow the effects thereof, verse 4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.* And by the same right also he

becomes the only and eternal Priest which hath to do in the most holy place, the heavens. For as the High Priest only entered the most holy place beyond the veil in the earthly tabernacle, so Jesus Christ, our only High Priest, through his body, as the first tabernacle, by his own blood, entered into the second tabernacle, or *holy place not made with hands*, as was the figure, but *into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us.* All this you have in the same words at large. (Heb. ix. 7, 11, 12, 24.)

Now in the tabernacle of this world, as in the first tabernacle, we may haply find many priests whom to employ as agents for us with God. But in the second tabernacle, which is in Heaven, there is but one agent to be employed, but *One* who hath royal commission to deal between God and men, that *Angel of the presence*, as Isaiah calls him chap. lxiii. 9; and *one only Mediator*, Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, who in this prerogative is above saints and angels; *for to which of the* saints or *angels said God at any time: Sit on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?* (Heb. i. 4, 9, 13.)

Neither will this demonstration admit that vulgar exception to be of any force, namely,—That *expiatory* mediation, or *meritorious* intercession in heaven, should indeed appertain to Christ alone, but *favourable intercession* to pray for us, not so; and, therefore, for this we may without derogation to Christ solicit either saints or angels. I might say, that this rag is too narrow and short to cover the nakedness of those

who lay hold of it; in whose supplications to saints, and to God too in their names, nothing is more usual than the express mention of their merits, blood, and sufferings, as motives to God to hear them. But we shall not need this answer. For we have demonstrated, that as in the law none but *the high priest alone* was to do office in the holiest place, so Christ Jesus now is the only agent for whatsoever is to be done for us in the holiest tabernacle, of *heaven*. Besides, we read, that none but the High Priest alone was to offer incense, or to incense the most holy place when he entered into it: but incense is *the prayers of the saints*, sent thither from this outward temple of the militant Church, as in the law it was fetched from without the veil. This, therefore, none in heaven but Christ alone must receive from us to offer for us. And this is that Angel with the *golden censer*, Rev. viii. 3, who there offers *the incense of the prayers of the saints* given him to offer there upon *the golden altar before the throne;* alluding expressly to the golden altar before the testimony.

For the fuller understanding and further confirmation of what hath been spoken, observe this also; That notwithstanding the man Christ Jesus in regard of his Person, being God as well as Man, was from his first incarnation capable of this royalty and glory; not only for the incomparable sufficiency of his Person, which by reason of his two-fold nature is always and in all places present both with God and men, and so at one instant able and ready at every need to present to

the one what he should receive from the other; but chiefly and most of all, for that being very God himself, his Father's jealousy, which could never have brooked the communication of this glory to any other which should not have been the self-same with himself was by this condition of his Person prevented and secured:—

Nevertheless and notwithstanding all this capability of his Person, it was the will of his Father, in the dispensation of the mystery of our redemption, not to confer it upon him, but as purchased and attained by suffering and undergoing of that death which no creature in heaven or in earth was able to undergo but himself; being a suffering of death, whereby Death itself was overcome and vanquished; to the end that none by death save Jesus Christ alone might be ever thought or deemed capable of the like glory and sublimity; but that it might appear for ever to be a right peculiar to Him.

And this, I think, is not only agreeable to the tenor of Scripture, but express Scripture itself. Heb. ii. 9, 10. *But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, by the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour. For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.* Phil. ii. 8. *And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;* v. 9, 10. *Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name above every*

name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow. Heb. x. 12. *But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.* Rom. xiv. 9. *For to this end Christ both died, rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living.* See besides, Acts v. 30, 31. Rom. viii. 34. Ephes. i. 20. 1 Pet. i. 11.

Lastly, as for that particular parcel of this glory of Christ, to be that only Name in which we are to ask at the hands of God whatsoever we have to ask; is not this also ascribed and annexed to his triumph over death? John xiv. 12, 13. *I go unto my Father,* (viz. through death;) *and whatsoever ye ask in my name that will I do.* John xvi. 16, and 23. *A little while, and ye shall not see me; and again a little while, and ye shall see me; because I go to my Father. And in that day* (when I am gone to my Father) *ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.* Verse 24. *Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask and ye shall receive.* Heb. vii. 25, 26. *Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him; seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an High Priest became us—who is made higher than the heavens.*

How is it, then, that some extenuate that kind of saint-worship, wherein prayers are not made unto them directly, but God is prayed to in their names and for their mediation sake to grant our requests? Is it not a denial of Christ's preroga-

tive, to ascribe unto any other, for any respect of glory or nearness to God after death or otherwise, that wherein he alone is infeoffed by his inimitable death, triumphant resurrection, and glorious ascension? Certainly that which he holds by an incommunicable title is itself also incommunicable.

To conclude, therefore, with the words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* As God is one, so is the Mediator one; for it is a God-like Royalty, and therefore can belong but to one. There is but one God in Heaven, without any other Gods subordinate to him; therefore but one Mediator there, without any other Mediator besides him. As for the angels and blessed saints, they have indeed a light of glory too, but they are but as lesser lights in that heaven of heavens. And therefore as where the Sun shines, the lesser stars of heaven, though stars, give not their light to us; so where this glorious Sun, Christ Jesus, continually shineth by his presence, sitting at the right hand of God, there the glory of the saints and angels is not sufficient to make them capable of any flower of that Divine honour which is God-like, and so is appropriate to Christ by right of his heavenly exaltation in the throne of Majesty. Whatsoever Spirit saith otherwise, *ου κρατει την κεφαλην*, holds not the head; but is a Christ-apostate spirit; which denies the faith of Christ's assumption into glory, and revives the *Doctrines of Demons.*

The way being now cleared, I may, I hope, safely resume my application, which I have

already given some taste of,—That this Doctrine of Demons, *comprehends in most express manner the whole Idolatry of the mystery of iniquity, the deifying and invocating of saints and angels, the bowing down to images, the worshipping of crosses* (as new idol columns), *the adoring and templing of reliques, the worshipping of any other visible thing, upon supposal of any divinity therein.* What copy was ever so like the sample, as all this to the *Doctrines of Demons?* And for the idolatry of the Eucharist, or bread-worship,—though it may be reduced to image-worship, as being the adoration of a sign, or symbol,—yet let it be considered whether, for the quality thereof, it may not be taken rather for an idolatry of reliques, the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament being the mystical reliques which he left us, as monuments of his death till he come. Whichsoever it be, I must confess it hath a strain above the abominations of the Gentiles; who, though they supposed some presence of their demons in their images and reliques, yet were they never so stupid as to think their images and reliques to be transubstantiated into demons.

But to come to the main again. I will confess, for myself, that I cannot think of this demon-resemblance without admiration; nor do I believe that you will hear, without some astonishment, that which I am now to add further,—that the advancers of *saint-worship* in the beginning did not only see it, but even gloried, but their glorying was not good, that they had a thing in Christian practice so like the *doctrines of*

demons. We heard before, that Plato in his *Republic*, would have the souls of such as died valiantly in battle to be accounted for demons after death, and their sepulchres and coffins to be served and adored as the sepulchres of demons. Eusebius, lib. 13, Præpar. Evangel. cap. 11, quoting this place, adds with it,* "These things do befit at (*or* after) the decease of the favourites of God, whom, if thou shalt affirm to be taken for the champions of the true religion, thou wilt not say amiss:† whence it is our custom to go unto their tombs, and to make our prayers at them, and to honour their blessed souls." The purpose of Eusebius here was to shew, as a preparation to draw men to Christianity, how well the then present usage of Christians in honouring the memories of their martyrs, by keeping their assemblies at their sepulchres, did agree with the Gentiles, so much commended by Plato, in honouring their champions and worthies for *demons* after death. But, alas! in the next age after, it proved too like it indeed: for these earrings, which the Christians had borrowed or stolen from the Gentiles at their coming out of Egypt, presently became a golden calf, as soon as the woman, the Church, came into the wilderness; yea, and Aaron the Priest had a foul part in it too.

* Ταῦτα δὲ ἁρμόζει ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν θεοφίλων τελευτῇ, οὓς στρατιώτας τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐυσέβείας, οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοις εἰπὼν παραλαμβάνεσθαι.

† ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θήκας ἀυτῶν ἔθος ἡμῖν παρίέναι καὶ τὰς ευχὰς παρὰ ταύταις ποιεῖσθαι, τιμῷν τε τὰς μακαριάς αὐτῶν ψυχὰς.

Read the eighth book of Theodoret, *On curing the affections of the Greeks*, whose title is *Concerning martyrs;* or in the mean time take these few passages thereof. Thus he speaks, having quoted that passage of Hesiod about demons, commended by Plato:—* "If, then, "the poet calls good men, after their decease, "the guardians, and preservers, or deliverers, of "mortal men from all evil; and accordingly the "best of philosophers, in confirmation of the "poet's saying, would have their sepulchres to "be served and honoured:—I beseech you, Sirs," he speaks to the Greeks, "why do you find "such fault with what we do? For such as "were eminent for piety, and religion, and for "the sake thereof suffered death, we also call "Preservers and Physicians: in no wise do we "term them *demons;* (God forbid we should "ever fall into such a desperate madness,) but "the hearty friends and servants of God."

† "That the souls of holy men, even when "they are out of the body, are in a capacity of

* Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ ἀλεξικάκους καὶ φύλακας θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἄριστα βεβιωκότας, ἔιτα τελευτήσαντας, προσηγόρευσεν· ἐκράτυνε δὲ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὸν λόγον τῶν φιλοσόφων ὁ ἄριστος, καὶ χρῆναι ἔφη καὶ θεραπέυειν τούτων καὶ προσκυνεῖν τὰς θήκας τί δῆτα μέμφεσθε τοῖς παῤ ἡμῶν γιγνομένοις, ὦ βέλτιστοι; τοὺς γὰρ ἐν ευσεβείᾳ λάμψαντας, καὶ ὑπὲρ ταύτης τὴν σφαγὴν δεξαμένους, ἀλεξικάκους ἡμεῖς καὶ ἰατροὺς ὀνομάζομεν, οὐ δαίμονας καλοῦντες, μὴ οὑτω λυττήσαιμεν ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ φίλους καὶ ἥνους θεράποντας,

† Οτι καὶ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν ανθρωπίνων δύνανται

" taking care of men's affairs, Plato affirms in " the eleventh book of his Laws. The philoso- " pher, you see, bids men believe even the vulgar " reports,*"—that is, the relations and stories which are commonly talked of, concerning the care which deceased souls have of men.—" But " you do not only disbelieve us; ye are utterly " unwilling even to hearken to the loud voice of " the events or effects themselves."

† " The martyrs' temples are frequently to be " seen, famous for their beauty and greatness."

‡ " They that are in health pray for the con- " tinuance thereof; and they that have been long " sick pray for recovery: the barren also pray for " children. And they that are to take a long " journey, desire them," the martyrs, " to be " their companions, or rather their guides, in the " journey."

§ " Not going to them as Gods, but making

πραγμάτων αἱ τῶν ὁσίων ψυχαὶ καὶ τοῖ σώματος ἐκτὸς γενόμεναι, ὁ Πλάτων καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ ενδεκάτῳ τῶν Νόμων ἐδίδαξε.

* *Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν φιλόσοφος κελεύει καὶ ταῖς φήμαις πιστεύειν· ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐ μονόν ἡμῖν ἀπιστεῖτε, καὶ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων φώνης βοώσης οὐ βούλεσθε—*

† *Οἱ δὲ τῶν μαρτύρων σηκοὶ λαμπροι καὶ περίβλεπτοι καὶ μεγέθει διαπρεπεῖς.*

‡ *Οἱ μὲν ὑγιαίνοντες αἰτοῦσι τῆς ὑγιείας τὴν φυλακήν ὁι δε τινι νόσῳ παλαίοντες την τῶν παθημάτων ἀπαλλαγήν· αἰτοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἄγονοι παῖδας και οἱ μὲν εἰς τινα ἀποδημιάν στελλόμενοι, λιπαροῦσι τούτους ξυνοδοιπόρους γενέσθαι καὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἡγεμόνας.*

§ *οὐχ ὡς θεοῖς ἀυτοῖς προσιόντες, ἀλλ' ὡς θείους*

" application to them as to Divine men and agents
" for them with God."

* " Now that they who made faithful prayers
" have obtained their petitions, clearly appears by
" the presents and gifts brought by the votaries,
" as so many grateful acknowledgments of their
" recovery. Accordingly some do present," to
" be hung up in the Church, " the effigies of
" eyes, others of hands; and these made of gold
" or of silver."

† " Nay, the Martyrs have utterly abolished
" and wiped out of the minds of men the memory
" of those who were called Gods."

‡ " Our Lord God hath brought his dead (viz.
" the Martyrs) into the place (the temples) of
" your Gods, whom he hath sent packing, and
" hath given their honour to his Martyrs. For
" instead of the feasts of Jupiter and Bacchus,
" are now celebrated the festivals of Peter and
" Paul, and Thomas and Sergius, &c., and other
" holy Martyrs."

ἀνθρώπους ἀντιβολοῦντες, καὶ γενέσθαι πρεσβευτὰς ὑπὲρ σφῶν παρακαλοῦντες.

* *Ὅτι δὲ τυγχάνουσιν ὧνπερ αἰτοῦσιν οἱ πιστῶς ἐπαγγέλλοντες, ἀναφανδὸν μαρτυρεῖ τὰ τούτων ἀναθήματα, τὴν ἰατρείαν δηλοῦντα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὀφθαλμῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ χειρῶν προσφέρουσιν ἐκτυπώματα· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ χρυσοῦ, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένα.*

† *καὶ γὰρ ἀυτῶν τῶν καλουμένων θεῶν τὴν μνήμην ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξήλειψαν διανοίας.*

‡ *τοὺς γὰρ οἰκείους νεκροὺς ὁ δεσπότης ἀντεισῆξε τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς, καὶ τοὺς μὴν φρούδους ἀπέφηνε, τούτοις δὲ τὰ ἐκείνων ἀπένειμε γέρα· ἀντὶ γὰρ τῶν Πανδίων καὶ*

* "Wherefore, since you see there is so much "advantage by honouring the Martyrs, be per- "suaded, I beseech you, to flee from the error of "*demons;* and making use of the Martyrs as so "many lights and guides, follow the way which "leads directly to God," &c.

Now judge whether *the doctrines of demons* hath hitherto been fitly applied or not:—I will go on.

Διονυσίων, Πέτρου καὶ Πάυλου, καὶ Θῶμᾶ καὶ Σεργίου, &c., *καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτύρων ἐπιτελοῦνται δημοθοινίαι.*

* *Ὁρῶντες τοίνυν τῆς τῶν μαρτύρων τίμῆς τὸ ὠφέλιμον, φεύγετε ὦ φίλοι, τῶν Δαιμόνων τὸν πλάνον· καὶ τουτοις φωστῆρσι καὶ ποδηγοῖς κεχρημένοι, τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἄγουσαν πορείαν οδεύσατε,* &c.

CHAPTER VIII.

That Idolatry is the main character of the Church's apostasy, proved by three arguments.

HAVING, therefore, by so many arguments, made apparent, as I hope, what I endeavoured to prove; I desire we may observe, among so many corruptions both now and heretofore overwhelming the Church of Christ, what that is wherein the Holy Ghost placeth the essence, and accounteth as the very soul, of the great apostasy under the man of sin, and would have us to make the pole-star of our discovery thereof. Not every error, not every heresy, how foul soever, but *Doctrines of Demons*, idolatry and spiritual fornication. As for other heresies, though accompanying this, yet are they but accidental, and not of the essence of the Great Apostasy which was to come. Even as harlots are seldom without other foul faults, which yet are no parts of whoredom, so hath the spiritual harlot many other heresies, but her whoredom is only idolatry and the *Doctrine of Demons*.

Neither is heresy of itself, no, though damnable heresy, a character whereby the Great Apostasy can be known from other sects and blasphemies. Foul heresies were in the first ages of the Church; yet Antichrist and his time were

neither of them yet come. When his time approached nearer, the Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutychians, were abominable heretics; and the Arians possessed for a time the face of the visible Church, yet was not theirs the solemn Apostasy looked for.

But Idolatry, or spiritual whoredom, which in that storm the Devil was a-working, this is the only character and note whereby the *Apostasy under the man of sin is discovered and distinguished from all other blasphemies, sects, and heresies, of what age or time soever.

Which that I may not seem to ground only upon the exposition of my text, which, whatsoever the probability thereof be, may yet be thought alone too weak to support the weight of so main a conclusion, I desire you to take these arguments for a full confirmation thereof. Some of them have already been intimated, but now all are mustered up together.

1. That Babylon is entitled, in the Revelation of St. John, not the liar of Babylon, nor the tyrant of Babylon, nor the heretic of Babylon, nor the murderess of Babylon, but the whore of Babylon, yea, that *great whore*, and the *mother of fornications and abominations of the earth*. Doth not God, think we, give the name as He accounts

* 1 Thess. i. 9. Conversion to Christianity is described as a *turning from idols to serve the true and living God, and to wait for his Son Jesus Christ*; therefore apostasy therefrom is a return to idols from the living and true God and his Son Jesus Christ.

the nature? Or is there any one will deny that this Babylon is that **mystery of iniquity* which our Apostle so calleth, as being in opposition to the great *mystery of* true *worship* and *religion?* If any should,† *Mystery, Babylon,* in her forehead, will help to reclaim him. And what whore is that with whom the kings, and nations, and kingdoms of the earth commit fornication? Can it be any other but a spiritual whore? Without question, therefore, St. John means no other thing here than what he foretold in the eleventh chapter. That the "second and outmost court of the temple, (which is the second state of the Christian Church,) together with the holy city, should be trodden down and overtrampled by the Gentiles forty-two months:"—that is, overwhelmed with the idolatry of the Gentiles, which is the *Doctrine of Demons,* as long as power shall be given to the beast to make war with the saints, as long as the witnesses must wear sackcloth, and the woman which escaped the fury of the heathen Dragon be fed in the wilderness.

2. St. Paul tells us,‡ that the Great Apostasy should enter by *strong delusions,* by *signs,* and *lying wonders.* Consider, then, what corruptions of the Christian faith were thus ushered in. To begin with the beginning and first corruption of that kind. Invocation of saints, with the adoration of their shrines and reliques,—how were these advanced in the Church? Was it not by miraculous cures of the sick, healing of the lame,

* Μυστηριον ευσεβειας. † Μυστηριον, Βαβυλων.
‡ 2 Thess. ii.

restoring of the blind—yea, raising of the dead (as seemed) by only the touch and air sometimes of the shrines and reliques of souls deceased? Was it not still confirmed by strange apparitions, and other means wonderful to hear, for discovery of bones and reliques unknown and forgotten,—yea, of men whose names they had never heard of before?—and, which, as I shall shew better hereafter, no such experience for three hundred years together observed in the Church, until the fatal and fixed time began to enter. The worshipping of images, (the second, in time, of the Church's fornications,) was not this also allured, and at length fully ratified by like *signs* and *miracles* shewed upon those who approached them in their devotions? Read the *Legend*, and see what store there is of *strong delusions*, and *lying wonders*. That which, for a time, came in last, but deserves a place among the foremost, I mean the idolatry of the mass, and adoration of the breaden God, search and see if it also be not thus attended.

If all this be true, then would I know what doctrine of theirs besides was installed with these solemnities. There is but one only left for an exception, and that is Purgatory; but what if all the delusions of purgatory, with all the apparitions of purgatorian ghosts, were but an indirect device of Satan, aiming partly to advance the mass into an idol, by the miraculous efficacy, as the ghosts forsooth report, of the oblation thereof for them; partly to instal the *son of perdition*, a demon I yet spake not of, and still a demon, to

sit as God in the temple and throne of Christ, with *the keys of hell and death*, to deliver them? What stronger presumption can there be of this than the event, and that the error of purgatory had so long been working before the Devil seemed to know how to make this use of it, which at length he spied out, and plied lustily with signs and wonders? If all this be true, then it follows still that it is spiritual fornication, which the Holy Ghost in Scripture intended, and the event hath marked out, for the soul of Antichristian abomination and impiety. But of the matter of *miracles* and *lying wonders*, more in the second part of my text, which is the proper place thereof.

3. And, lastly, the great apostasy is a thing proper to **the latter times;* which I will shew, when I come to it, to be the last times of the fourth kingdom of Daniel, Dan. vii. 25, and alibi. But amongst all other corruptions, only the spiritual fornication of the Church and Spouse of Christ will be found proper to these times.

* ὕστεροι καιροὶ.

CHAPTER IX.

Two exceptions against the foregoing assertion, that Idolatry should rather be laid upon the Pagans.—This answered and proved, that Pagan Idolatry is not meant, nor the Saracen or Turk the Antichrist meant, in Scripture.—That Antichristianism cannot be charged upon those that acknowledge the true God and Christ.—The answer to this, wherein is interwoven the Author's serious and pathetical expostulation with the Church of Rome.—That Antichrist is a counter-christ, and his coming a counter-resemblance of the coming of Christ, shewn in several particulars.

BUT you will still allege for her behalf who seems all this while to be charged, that Antichrist and the Man of Sin is set forth in Scripture as the most hateful and execrable thing that can be in the eyes of God Almighty; but how can such a thing be said, and comparatively be, where the true God, with Christ his Son, God and man, are in any sort acknowledged and worshipped? (*h*)

Lord! that the whole train of Scripture, in the prophets especially, and the example of the Church of Israel, should not cure this web, and take this film from the eyes of men! Doth not the Lord say of Israel, that He had chosen them to be a special people to himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth? Deut. vii. 6. *You only have I known*, saith he, *of all the families of earth.* (Amos iii. 2.) And is not Christ the Lord of Christians, and is not

the Church his Spouse? * *This is a great mystery.* Ephes. v. 32. No marvel, then, where this mystery is not considered, if the mystery of iniquity be not understood.

Alas, poor Church of Israel! thy case, it seems, must have been a very hard one. For what nation in the world ever suffered so much rebuke, so many plagues, so much wrath as thou hast done? Yet couldst thou say for thyself, thou never forsookest the true God altogether, but wast still called by His name; only thou wouldst fain worship Him in calves and images, as other nations, thy neighbours, did their Gods; thou wouldst needs follow the fashion, and this was thine error. Thou never meantest to cast off thy Jehovah altogether, but still wouldst have him to be thy God, and thyself to be his people; yet thou tookest this liberty, to have *other Gods besides* the Lord thy God, viz., thy Baalims and demon-gods of other nations about thee; and yet hopedst that Jehovah the God of heaven, thy only Sovereign God, would not be offended thereat, since thou retainedst him still in chief place and honour with thee.

Why was thy God, then, so unkind and cruel unto thee, to call thee whore and prostitute so often; all his prophets continually baiting thee with that so foul and odious a name of *abominable harlot?* Why did He scatter thee, and even drive thee naked among the nations, before his jealousy would be satisfied? For it seems He is

* τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστιν.

far more indulgent to his second wife, the Church of the Gentiles. For she worships her God in images and crucifixes, yea, calls a piece of bread her Lord and her God; and yet saith, He is no whit jealous of her, but well pleased. She, though espoused to Christ Jesus, the Son of the living God, as her sole mediator and intercessor in the presence of God his Father, yet thinks she may fall down to Saints and Angels, yea to as many images of them as ever the Jews had of their Baalims, or the Gentiles of their demons. And yet, forsooth, because she makes her Lord the chiefest still in the honour of her affection, and uses the rest of her lovers no farther than she may still yield the first and chief place to him, she verily supposes he is no whit offended with her: whereas Israel would have been called a whore a thousand times over for as little as this; yea and like enough to have been cast off too, and her nose slit, (Ezek. xxiii. 25,) long before this time.

Nay, but she wipes her mouth, and asks why her Lord should be angry; for she calls him still her Lord, and acknowledges and professes him still to be her husband. If He hath a mind to be angry with any, let him go to the Turks, Tartars, and other Mahometans, or to the Pagans, who will not acknowledge him at all to be their Lord, though he hath offered himself, and perhaps wooed some of them; but they would none of him, but have married themselves to other husbands: here, if he will be jealous, is matter for his jealousy.

But, thou Christ-Apostatical strumpet, knowest thou not the first commandment of thy Christian decalogue to be, *thou shalt have no other* Christs *but me?* What doest thou, then, with so many Christlings? Knowest thou not that an husband is more grieved and dishonoured by his wife's adultery, than if any other woman whatsoever, yea suppose his kinswomen and daughters, should play the harlot?

What are Turks, Tartars, or any other unbelieving nation under heaven, unto thy Lord and Saviour? * Are they not all as strangers to Him, and He to them? But as for thee, He had chosen thee out of many nations to espouse thee to himself; so that thou mayest say with Israel, (Isa. lxiii. 19,) *We are thine; but as for them, thou never bearest rule over them; they were not called by thy name.* But to thee, to use the words of Ezekiel, ch. xvi. ver. 8, &c., he *sware an oath, and entered into a covenant with thee, and thou becamest his, and wert called,* and wilt still be called, *by his name.* Thee he washed with water, yea, thoroughly washed thee from the pollution of thy birth, and anointed thee with oil. Thou wast decked with gold and silver, and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk, and broidered work; thou didst eat fine flour, and honey, and oil, and wast exceeding beautiful, and

* Jerome in Ez. xliii. dicit, Ego hoc arbitror quod non polluat nomen Domini, nisi ille qui visus est nomini ejus credere: et quomodo *tollit membra Christi, et facit membra meretricis,* qui prius Christo credidit; sic ille polluit nomen Domini qui prius nominis ejus fidem susceperit.

didst prosper into a kingdom. And thy renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty; for it was perfect through the comeliness which the Lord thy God had put upon thee. But thou didst trust in thine own beauty, and playedst the harlot because of thy renown, and pouredst out thy fornications upon every one that passed by.

And of thy garments thou didst take, and deckedst thy high places with divers colours, and playedst the harlot thereupon. Thou hast also taken thy fair jewels of thy Lord's gold, and of thy Lord's silver, which he had given thee, and madest to thyself images of men, and didst commit whoredom with them; and tookedst thy broidered garments, and coveredst them; and thou hast set the Lord's oil and his incense before them. (Ez. xvi. 13—19.)

Judge now between the Lord and his people, ye that have wives; give sentence, ye husbands,—whether of the two in question hath most dishonoured our Lord and Saviour; which of the two is most likely to fret him, and kindle the coals of fury and jealousy—those who never were in covenant with him, nor yet are called by his name; or whether his spouse, his darling and beloved one, to whom he was betrothed and married. Judge according to the manner of wedlock, and the notorious precedent of Israel. He that is a father, we say, is best able to understand the love of a father, and, therefore, God's love to his children. For the like reason, he that is an husband is sensible of the jealousy of an husband; and so of the case of Christ, with his

unfaithful and treacherous spouse, the Christian Jezebel.

The decision and sum of all is this. That the whoredom of the Church of God is a spiritual adultery; and, therefore, between the idolatry of Christians and that of Infidels and Paynims is as much difference, in God's esteem, as is between adultery and simple fornication. The one, as equal to murder, was in the law punished with death; the other with a much lighter punishment. Whence in Ezekiel, on whose words I have dwelt so long, ch. xvi. ver. 38, God saith to Jerusalem, for their idolatry, that he would *judge her as women that break wedlock, and shed blood, are judged;* he would *give her blood in fury and jealousy.* And this was the resolution of God himself against Israel. (Amos iii. 1, 2.) "*Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore, will I punish you for all your iniquities.*" And the same will be the judgment of the Christian Jezebel, howsoever Pagans and Infidels speed, when great Babylon shall *come in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.*

This I would have well considered and weighed by those whom the Mahometan blasphemy hath so dazzled, that they can hardly believe so hated and execrable a name as that of Babylon should belong unto any other, unless there be yet to come some other like barbarous tyrant and seducer after them. The cause of which error

is, that men have fancied another Antichrist than the Holy Ghost meant of; and placed their eyes far wide of the ground of God's hatred, and of the nature of that mystery of abomination. But Israel's apostasy, God's jealousy, and their unparalleled punishment on account of it, such as no nation in the world, how idolatrous soever, endured besides themselves, are in this case the only pole-star to direct us.

But even this mistake, which is and hath been, of the *mystery of iniquity*, is itself a kind of mystery, or not without one: for Antichrist is a counter-Christ, and therefore his coming to be a counter-resemblance of the coming of Christ.

Christ was both to come, and accordingly looked for, in the last times; that is, in the time of the fourth kingdom of Daniel. So Antichrist and his mystery of impiety was to be in the *latter times* of those last times, that is, as I shall better shew hereafter, in the last times or last scene, as I may so speak, of the fourth kingdom of Daniel.*

When Christ came, the *sceptre* was to *depart from Judah*, and that commonwealth to be dissolved: so when Antichrist was to come, the Roman empire was to fall, and *he that hindered* was to be *taken out of the way*. 2 Thess. ii. 7.

The Jews expected Christ to come when he did come, and yet knew him not when he was come; because they had fancied the manner and quality of his coming like some temporal monarch, with armed power to subdue the earth before

* εν υστεροις καιροις.

him. So the Christians, God's second Israel, looked that the coming of Antichrist should be at that time when he came indeed, and yet they knew him not when he was come; because they had fancied his coming as of some barbarous tyrant, who should with armed power not only persecute and destroy the Church of Christ, but almost the world; that is, they looked for such an Antichrist as the Jews looked for a Christ.

Wherefore, as Christ *came unto his own, and his own received him not;* so Antichrist came upon those who were not his own, and yet they eschewed him not: but yet as some Jews, though few, knew Christ when he came, and received him; so did some Christians, though but few, keep themselves from the pollution of Antichrist.

Lastly, as the Jews ere long shall acknowledge and run unto him, whom they pierced as not knowing him: so hath the Christian Church, for a great part, discovered that Son of Perdition, whom a long time they had ignorantly worshipped, because they knew him not. O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

But for our part, seeing our case is so like unto that of the Jews, let their lamentable and woeful error, in mistaking their Messiah by wrongly fancying him, be a warning and caveat unto us, that we likewise, upon like conceits and prejudice, mistake and misdeem not *the Man of Sin.*

CHAPTER X.

The second particular in the description of the great apostasy, viz., the persons apostatizing expressed by (TINEΣ, SOME). *—The great apostasy was to be a general one.—The word* [TINEΣ, SOME] *doth not always imply a few, or a small number, proved by several passages in Scripture.—The true Church of Christ was never wholly extinguished.—Wherein we and the Papists differ about the Church's visibility.—In what respects our Church was visible, and in what it was invisible under the apostasy and reign of Antichrist. —This is further cleared by the parallel state of the Israelitish Church under the apostasy of Israel.*

Now I come unto the second point expressed in this description of the Great Apostasy, namely, *the persons* revolting. They should not be all, but some.*—"Some shall apostatize.†" Not, as we in our English do often use it, a few; but *some*, that is, not all. Yet *some*, that is, so many, as that the whole visible Church should be therefore said to be apostatized; so many as should like a cloud overspread the face of the Christian firmament, in such sort as the stars and lights therein should not be easily discerned. For the great defection so much prophesied of was to be a solemn and general one; such a one as wherein the chiefest of the Churches, honoured as *a mother in Israel*, should become a Babylonish whore, a *mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth* (Rev. xvii.): such a one as

* TINE'Σ. † *τινὲς ἀποστήσονται.*

whereby the outmost court of the Temple of God should not only be profaned, but *trodden down by Gentilism.* Revel. xi. Such a one as the world is said to *wonder after the beast and worship him;* and such a one as should not only *make war with the Saints,* but *overcome them.* Rev. xiii. Otherwise, if our Apostle here, and St. John there, should mean no more but the errors of some particular ones, and their revolt from the faith of the Church, they should make either no prophecy at all, or at the best but a needless one.

For who knows not that in St. Paul's, St. John's, and the Apostles' own times, were many heresies and heretics grown up as weeds in the wheat-field of Christ? But as yet the wheat overtopped them, and the visible body of the Church disclaimed them. If these had been the worst the Church should look for, the Apostles would seem to prophesy of things present, and not, as they do, of things to come; yea, and more than this—they would foretel of a thing as proper and peculiar to the last times, which was no novelty in their own times.

We must take notice, therefore, that the apostasy and corruption of faith so much prophesied of was another manner of one than that which was so frequent in those first times; such a kind of one as should not be disclaimed by the visible body of the Church, but should surprise, eclipse, and overcloud the beautiful face thereof; which manner of defection never had been before, nor should the like be after it.

Now that the word, *some*, useth in Scripture to imply no small number, but only serves to intimate an exception of some particulars, though there were but two or three to be excepted, I will make manifest by a few examples, lest our English use might deceive us.

First, John vi. 60, *Many of the disciples*, saith the text, *when they heard this, said, This is an hard saying;* and v. 66, *Many of his disciples from that time went back, and walked no more with him.* Nevertheless, concerning these *many*, Christ himself saith, v. 64,* "But there are *some* of you which believe not." Here we see that some is a great many. So Rom. ii. 17. St. Paul there saith of the rejection of the Jews, *Some of the branches are broken off.* Now what a *some* this was, appears in the same chapter, v. 32, when he saith, "God hath included them *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon *all.*" But to seek no further, the 1 Cor. X. will store us with examples: as v. 7, "Neither be ye idolaters,† as *some* of them were." This was a great *Some*, for Moses saith of it, Exodus xxxii. 3, "And *all* the people brake off their golden ear-rings, and brought them to Aaron." In v. 8, "*Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them;*" which were so many, Numb. xxv. 4, that the Lord said unto Moses, "Take *all* the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel;" and v. 3, it is said

* Ἀλλ' εἰσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινὲς.
† καθώς τινες αὐτῶν.

in general, " and Israel joined himself to Baal-Peor." Again in the same chap., v. 9, it is said, " Neither let us tempt Christ, as *some* of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents;" and v. 10, " Neither murmur, as some of them also murmured." This *some* was a great *some* indeed, even all the people, save Moses, Joshua, and Caleb; whereof is said, Numb. xiv. 1, " And *all* the congregation lifted up their voice and wept:" and v. 2, " And *all* the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron; and *the whole congregation* said unto them, would God that we had died, &c.," wherefore they were as largely punished, all of them dying in the wilderness, Joshua and Caleb excepted. These places out of many will suffice, to shew that the word, *some*, in my text, intends not to extenuate the number of apostates, as implying they should be but *few;* but only shews they should not be *all.* For where the apostates are but some, there some also are not apostates, but excepted from the common defection, wherewith the rest were miserably overwhelmed.

The observation, therefore, which this, *some*, affords us is, That the true Church of Christ was never wholly extinguished, nor the light of his Gospel ever quite put out; no, not in the greatest darkness that ever was to overwhelm it.

By the true Church of Christ I understand—That holy Society and Company of Believers, which as they accord and are joined together in one common Faith of all Divine truths needful to salvation, so are they also free from the fellow-

ship of such enormous abominations, and mortal errors as destroy and overturn it. This is that Society whereof, by the grace of Almighty God, we glory to be members; this that Society which in the primitive times grew and flourished; this that Society which, when the times foretold of the Church's eclipse came, and the Great Apostasy had overspread the face thereof, was indeed much impaired, endangered, and obscured, but never was totally extinguished, but continued even under the jurisdiction of the *Man of Sin*, yea in Babylon itself where he had this Throne: for doth not Christ at length say, Rev. xviii. 4, *Come out of her, my people?* How could they come out thence, unless they had been there? or how should Antichrist *sit in the temple of God*, 2 Thess. ii. 4, unless God's Temple were even there where Antichrist sate? As a few living embers in a heap of dying ashes; as a little wheat in a field overgrown with weeds; as the lights of the heaven in a firmament overcast with clouds; as a little pure gold in a great mass of dross and mixed metal; such was the faithful company of Christ in the Apostate body of Christendom, the * Virgin Church in the midst of Babylon.

But our adversaries will say, this is not sufficient to make you the true Church of Christ, because some of you have always been; but you must prove also that you have always visibly been: for the true Catholic Church must not only never have been interrupted or extinguished,

* Rev. xiv. 4.

but it must have been a society visibly known unto the world, and not as embers in the ashes, but as a burning and shining flame.

But this objection deserves no answering; because our adversaries, howsoever they would dissemble it, do but play upon the present advantage which they think their own Church hath in this point above ours. Otherwise, when they forget the contention they have with us, and are in a calmer mood, they can be pleased to deliver other doctrine; which if they would be so ingenuous as always to remember, we needed not such a stir about the point of the Church's visibility. For the difference between them and us hereabout is not so great as they would make it seem. They themselves, and the Fathers also, teach, that when Antichrist cometh, the visibility of the Church shall be eclipsed: nay, they affirm more than we usually in that case require; for then, they say, the use of the sacraments shall cease; no eucharist, no mass, no public assemblies—yea, all ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall be extinguished. But here lies all the difference: they hold the glorious visibility of the true Church to have continued from the beginning unto this present, and the overshadowing of the light and eclipse of the glory thereof under Antichrist to be yet to come. We on the contrary maintain the clouding of the Church's visibility under the Man of Sin to have been already, and some part of the visible splendour thereof to be yet to come: both agreeing in this, that in the fatal Apostasy the Church's visibility and glory

should cease; but we say, That time hath been already; they say, It is yet to come. We say, That time of darkness was to continue many ages; they say, When it comes, it shall last but three single years and a half. Seeing, therefore, the whole controversy lies in the point of time, whether the Church's fatal Apostasy be already past or yet to come; it would be much the shorter and quicker course for both them and us to decide this controversy, to examine the condition and quality of both religions by the Holy Scripture, where we have also, as St. Peter speaks, a *more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we shall do well if we take heed as to a light shining in a dark place.*

Now, though this answer be sufficient enough for the objection of our adversaries; yet, for the better understanding and clearer insight into the matter questioned, we will further consider, Whether and in what manner or measure our Church may be said to have been visible during the prevailing Apostasy, and in what respect again it was not visible; and in both agreeable to the state of the true Church under the frequent Apostasies of Israel.

First, therefore, we must know that by a visible Christian society in this question is meant a society or company of Christian believers joined together in one external fellowship and communion of the same public profession and rule of faith, use of sacraments, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. For these make the outward form and (as it were) shape of the Church, whereby

this society is discernible from other societies of men. So that a society by this outside, severed and distinguished from other societies, is a *society visible*, and conspicuous to other societies of men.

The question, therefore is, Whether that holy society of believers before mentioned, who accorded together in "one common faith with us, of all divine truths needful to salvation," and kept themselves free from such enormous abominations and mortal errors, which we now disclaim, as utterly annihilating that common faith; whether such a society as this has been in all ages, joined and distinguished by such a common outside from other companies, either of men in general, or Christians in special? Or in shorter, and perhaps plainer terms thus, Whether the society of men of our Christian belief hath in all ages been for the outside, a distinct ecclesiastical corporation from other societies of men?

My answer is, that for the first ages it was so; not only thus visible, but easily discernible from all other societies of men whatsoever; but afterward, when the Great Apostasy we speak of surprised and deformed the beautiful Spouse of Christ, then was not that Virgin-company of saints, our Mother, a distinct external society from the rest of Christendom; but a part, yea and the only sound part, of that external and visible body whereof our adversaries boast their predecessors to have been members. For howsoever this our Virgin Mother, for the inward and invisible communion of her sincere and

unstained faith, were a distinct and severed Company from the rest, with whom she lived; yet, for the common principles of the Christian faith still acknowledged in that corrupt body of Christendom, she retained communion with them, and for the most part of that time of darkness continued an external part of the same visible body with the rest in gross called Christians; as being begotten by the same sacrament of baptism (as the Israelites in the like case of circumcision), taught in some part by the same *word* and *pastors* still continued amongst them, and submitting to the same jurisdiction and government, so far as these or any of these had yet some soundness remaining in them. But for the rest which was not compatible with her sincere and unstained faith, and which annihilated, in those it surprised, even those common grounds of Christianity otherwise outwardly professed; she with her children either wisely avoided all communion with it; or if they could not, then patiently suffered for their conscience sake under the hands of tyrants, called Christians; until that tyranny growing insupportable, and that mortal contagion unavoidable, it pleased God, lest we might have been as Sodom and Gomorrha, to begin to call us thence, at the time appointed, unto a greater liberty, as we see this day.

As, therefore, when a little gold is mixed with a great quantity of base and counterfeit metal, so that of both is made but one mass or lump; each metal, we know, still retains its nature diverse from the other, and yet outwardly and

visibly is not to be discerned the one from the other; but both are seen together as they are outwardly one, but cannot be distinguished by the eye as they are diverse and several; the gold is visible as it is one mass, and under the same outside and figure with the rest, yet it is truly invisible, as it is diverse from the rest: but when the refiner comes and severs them, then will each metal appear in its own colours, and put on its own outside, and so become visible apart from the rest: such is the case here, and such was the state and condition of the Church in the prevailing and Great Apostasy. The purer metal of the visible Christian body was not outwardly discernible from the base and counterfeit, while one outside covered them; and so much the rather, because the Apostate part in a great proportion exceeding the sound, made it imperceptible. But when the time of refining came, then was our Church not first founded in the true faith. God forbid; but a part of the Christian body newly refined from such corruptions as time hath gathered; even as gold refined begins not then first to be gold, though it begin but then to be refined gold.

Whatsoever we have hitherto spoken of the state of the true believers under the Apostasy of Antichrist, is the same which befel the true Israelites in the Apostasy of Israel. And doth not St. Peter intimate that the Apostasy which should betide Christians would be like to that which we read to have befallen Israel, 2 Peter ii. 1? *There were*, saith he, *false prophets also among*

the people (*i. e.* Israelites), *even* AS *there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.* If the Apostasy of Christians were to be of the same stamp with that of Israel, and the heresies brought into Christendom by the false doctors of Babylon, like unto those wherewith the false prophets of Israel infected and poisoned the ancient people of God; surely we cannot find a better pattern whereby to know what was the state and condition of the unstained Christian believers under the Apostasy of the Man of Sin, than that which was of the true Israelites under the Apostasy of Israel.

For the right understanding whereof, we must always remember that the Israelitish Church did at no time altogether renounce the true and living God, not in their worst times; but in their own conceit and profession they acknowledged him still, and were called his people, and he their God, though they worshipped others beside him. So Christians, in their Apostasy, neither did nor were to make an absolute Apostasy from God the Father and Christ their Redeemer, but in an outward profession still to acknowledge him, and to be called Christians; though by their idolatry and spiritual whoredoms they indeed denied the Lord that bought them—*i. e.* whom they professed to be their Redeemer; just as Israel for the like is said to have forsaken the Lord their God that brought them out of the land of Egypt. Here, therefore, the case of both is alike; let us also see the rest.

You ask, where was the true Church we speak of in Antichrist's time? I ask likewise, where was the company of true worshippers in Ahab's time? Was it not so covered and scattered under the Apostate Israelites, that Elias himself, who was one of it, could scarce find it? *I have been very jealous*, saith he, *for the Lord God of Hosts; because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I alone, am left, and they seek my life to take it away.*—1 Kings, xix. 14. Yet the Lord tells him, ver. 18, *I have yet left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.* Yet I trow these seven thousand were not outwardly severed from the rest of Israel, but remained still external members of the same visible body with them.

But you will object that the true and unstained Church in Judah was still visible and apparent. I ask you, then, Where was the company of the true worshippers of Jehovah in Manasses' time, the worst time of all?—when the ten tribes were carried captive, and but Judah and Benjamin only left; and they, as far as the eye of man can see, wholly and generally fallen from the Lord their God to all manner of idols and idolatries, *like unto the abominations of the heathen, whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel;* when in the temple itself, the only place where the true God was legally to be worshipped, were idolatrous altars erected, even in *the house whereof*

the Lord had said, In this house, and in Jerusalem, will I put my name for ever. Even in this house, in this holy house, were idols and graven images erected, and in both courts thereof altars to Baalim, the sun, the moon, and the whole host of heaven, the like whereof never had been until that time. Besides, who is able to name the man for almost fifty years together that remained a faithful servant and true worshipper of the living God in the midst of this hideous profanation? Nor is it easy to be conceived how it was possible all that time to offer any legal sacrifice without idolatry, when God's own temple and house was made a den of idols; nay, his altar, the only altar of Israel, destroyed, to make room for altars erected to idols; as may be gathered 2 Chron. xxxiii. 15, 16. Where was the true Church of Israel now? or had the Lord no Church at all? Yes, certainly, he had a Church, and a company which defiled not their garments; a company, I say, but not visibly distinguished from the rest of their nation, but hidden, as it were, in the midst of that Apostate body, and yet known together with the rest to be Israelites and people of Jehovah; but known to God alone and themselves to be true Israelites and faithful servants to Jehovah their God. And that such a company there was, and a strong party too, though not seen, appeared presently upon the death of Manasses and his wicked son, when Josiah began to reign at eight years of age. For they then prevailed even in the court itself, and so brought up the King, that even *while he was*

yet young, in the eighth year of his reign, he began to seek after the God of David his father, and in the twelfth year to make a public and powerful reformation, such as the like was never done before him. Could all this have been done so soon, and by a King so young in years, and to carry all before it like a torrent, unless there had been a strong party, which now having a King for them, began quickly to shew themselves and to sway the State, though before they were hardly to be seen?

When, therefore, our adversaries ask us where our Church was before Luther, we see by this what we have to answer.

CHAPTER XI.

The third particular, or the time of the Apostasy—That the Last Times in Scripture signify either a continuation of time, or an end of time.—That the Last Times, simply and in general, are the times of Christianity; the Last Times in special and comparatively, or the latter times of the Last Times, are the times of the Apostasy under Antichrist.—That the times are set out to us to be as marks to inform us when the things to fall out in them should come to pass; and not the things intended for signs to know the times by.—This observation illustrated from Dan. viii.

Of the two first particulars of the four, whereby the Great Apostasy of Christian believers is here decyphered, I have spoken sufficiently—viz. first, for the quality and kind thereof, it should be *a new doctrine of demons;* secondly, that for *the persons* revolting, they should not be *all,* but *some.* Now I am to speak of the third, the time when,* *in the latter times.*

For the easier understanding whereof, we must know that speeches of *last times* in Scripture mean sometimes a *continuation or length of time;* sometimes an *end of time.*

A *continuation of time* I mean, as when we say that winter is the last time or season of the year, or old age the latter time of life; neither of them being the very end, but a space of time next the end; which, therefore, in respect of

* Ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς.

some whole system of time, whereof it is the last part, is truly termed the last time thereof. Man's life is a system of divers ages, the last space whereof is the last time of life. The year is a system of four seasons, and, therefore, the last season thereof, winter, may be called the last time of the year. But by an end of time, I mean the very expiring of time, as the last day of December is the end or last time of the year; the moment when a man dies is the last time, that is, the end of his life.

Now, in the New Testament, when by mention of last time is meant an end, (or terminus temporis,) I observe it to be expressed in the singular number; as * *the last* day, being four times mentioned in the sixth of John, and once in the eleventh, is in every one of them meant of the day of the resurrection at the end of the world. "*I will raise him up*," saith our Saviour, "† *in the last day.*" (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54.) And Martha of her brother Lazarus, "*I know* (saith she) *he shall rise again in the resurrection,*‡ *at the last day.*" (John xi. 24.) So, 1 Pet. 1, 5,§ the last time is used in the self-same sense, being spoken of the "*incorruptible inheritance reserved in heaven*, and to be *revealed* (saith the Apostle)‖ *in the last time.*" In all which is meant, the end of the world. But, in 1 John ii. 18, we have ¶ the last hour,—"*little children, it is the last hour;*" where, no doubt, he meaneth an end of some

* ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα.
† ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
‡ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
§ ἔσχατος καιρὸς.
‖ ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.
¶ ἐσχάτη ὥρα.

time, but not the end of the world, which was then far off; but an end of their time to whom he then wrote his epistle; that is, an end of the Jewish state and religion, which was then at the very door; which exposition I will make more plain hereafter.

But when a continuation or longer space of time is signified, then I find the plural number to be used; as 1 Pet. i. 20, of the incarnation of Christ it is said, that "*he was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but he was made manifest* * *in the last times,*" which times have continued these sixteen hundred years at the least. So Heb. i. 2, "*God* (saith St. Paul) † *in these last days hath spoken unto us by his Son.*" And, 2 Tim. ii. 1, "*This know also,*‡ *that in the last days, perilous times shall come.*" Again, Acts ii. 17, "*In the last days I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.*" In the 2 Pet. iii. 3, "§ *In the last days shall come scoffers.*" And so in my text, "‖ *In the latter times shall some revolt from the faith, and give heed to doctrines of demons.*"

Whatsoever the validity of this observation be, for the rest I make no question but it will be granted, that *the latter times* in my text means some continued space of time, and not (*terminus temporis* or) the very end of time: which therefore presupposed, I approach one step nearer, laying this for a second ground of our discovery,

* ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων. † ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμέρων.
‡ Ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. § Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερων.
‖ Ἐν ὑστέροις καιροὶς.

that these (ὑστεροι καιροι) *latter times*, whereof St. Paul speaks and means, were times not then present, but afterwards to come: for the words of the text are not a narration of things present, but a *prediction* (as I have already admonished) of what should betide the Christian faith *in after times*. Yet notwithstanding were the times wherein St. Paul lived, and all the times of Christianity, the *last times*, and so styled in Scripture even by our Apostle himself, as by some of the forecited examples evidently appeareth. Wherefore it must needs follow, that the times here meant and mentioned in my text are not the last times in general and simply, but the last times in special and comparatively; that is, the *latter times* of the *last times*: that as the last times in general were the times wherein Christ the Sun of Righteousness was to be revealed, and his kingdom founded in the world; so the latter times of these last times should be the times wherein the apostasy of the Christian faith should prevail, and that wicked one usurp the throne of Christ.

Before, therefore, that we can know what are the last times comparatively, (that is, the *latter times*, or the last of the last,) we must first understand what are the last times simply and in general; why so called, whence reckoned, and how limited: for then will these latter times in my text, which are the last part of them, be easily found, and in a manner demonstrated.

As for the last times, therefore, in general, most use to describe them only thus, to be the times of the kingdom of Christ, which began at

his passion, to continue unto the end of the world; which in respect that it succeeds the legal worship, and no other shall succeed it, is, therefore, the last time. In like manner, the "latter times"* allotted to the Man of Sin are (as I take it) usually no otherwise described than to be the times wherein the apostasy should appear; which since they should immediately precede the second coming of Christ, are therefore, to be esteemed the last times of all. But these descriptions are *obscurum per magis obscurum*, they declare an obscure thing by that which is or was more obscure than it; and, therefore, come short of making good the intent of the Holy Ghost in his so often mention of the last times, especially in the New Testament. For the last times or fulness of time were both a ground of the Jews' expectation of Christ when he came, and are without doubt so often propounded and alleged by the apostles for a confirmation of the truth of his coming. But if the last times could not be known but by his coming, how should his coming be known by them? So also the Holy Ghost in my text mentions these *latter times* for an argument or sign of the apostasy to fall out therein, or for a note and mark of time wherein we should look for it, and, therefore, as forewarned, beware of being carried away in that defection. But if these times cannot be known nor described any other way than by the defection to fall out in them, we should never be a whit the nearer, and

* υστεροι καιροι.

this mark of time which the Holy Ghost gives us would stand us in no stead at all.

Let us, therefore, now take this as a truth to be supposed, that the times are set out unto us to be as marks to inform us when that should come to pass which was to fall out in them, and not the things which were to befall, intended for signs to know the times by. And, therefore, we are not to doubt but that the Holy Ghost hath somewhere else, by some other mark and ground of computation, made known unto us when to reckon both the last times, wherein was foretold that Christ should be anointed; and these latter times of them, when the Christian apostasy should be revealed: that so we might have a sure belief in the one, and a certain and sufficient mark when to beware of the other.

The profanation of the legal sanctuary and trampling down the holy people by Antiochus Epiphanes was marked out in Daniel's prophecy by the like circumstance and determination of time, as is this Apostasy here in our Apostle's prediction. (Dan. viii. 23.) *In the latter time*, or latter end of the kingdom of Græcia, "*a king of a fierce countenance shall stand up*," viz.—he who should magnify himself against the prince of the host of heaven, and take away the daily sacrifice, &c., as it is in the vision which was foreshowed of him, verses 10, 11. Where it would be preposterous to think, that this latter time or end of the Greek kingdom could not be defined otherwise than by the event to fall out therein; and not rather conceive that this deter-

mination of time, being such as might otherwise well enough be known, was therefore intended for a character to observe the event by. For when was this latter end of the Greeks' kingdom to be taken notice of, but then when they should see that kingdom begin to be given unto another people; when *the fourth kingdom*, the Roman state, should once begin to encroach upon the third? especially when they should see the head province thereof, Greece itself, to come under their obedience; when they should see this, then were they to prepare themselves; for the abomination of desolation was now at the door. And surely the event was most punctual: for this Roman encroachment, having been some twenty-eight years together manifestly attempting and advancing, was at length, accomplished when, Aemilius the consul having quite vanquished Perseus the king of Macedon, all Greece came under the Roman obedience, one hundred and sixty-six years before the birth of Christ: which no sooner was to come to pass, but the very self-same year, within less than three months after, Antiochus set up *the abomination of desolation* in the temple of Jerusalem. Why should we not, then, believe that the Holy Ghost intendeth here to give us as sure a watchword when to beware of the Man of Sin, by this circumstance of latter times in my text, as we see he gave the Jews to look for the persecution and profanation by Antiochus?

CHAPTER XII.

A more particular account of the last times in general, and of the latter times of the last times.—That the four kingdoms of Daniel are the great kalendar (as the seventy weeks the lesser kalendar) of times.—That the times of the fourth or last kingdom (that is, the Roman) are the last times meant in Scripture.—That the latter times of the Last Times are the latter times of the fourth kingdom, wherein the Great Apostasy should prevail.

THEREFORE, without any more preambles, I come now directly to resolve what was before propounded, viz.,—First, What is meant by *Last Times* in general, whence and how we are to reckon them. And then, in the Second place, What are these *Latter Times* in my text, which must be, as I said before, a latter part of that general.

For the true account, therefore, of Times in Scripture, we must have recourse to that SACRED KALENDAR AND GREAT ALMANACK OF PROPHECY, the Four Kingdoms of Daniel, which are *a prophetical chronology of times measured by the succession of four principal kingdoms, from the beginning of the captivity of Israel, until the mystery of God should be finished.* A course of time during which the Church and nation of the Jews, together with those whom, by occasion of their unbelief in Christ, God should surrogate in their room, was to

remain under the bondage of the Gentiles and oppression of Gentilism. But these times once finished, all the kingdoms of this world should become *the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.* And to this Great Kalendar of Times, together with that other, but lesser Kalendar, of LXX weeks, all mention of times in Scripture seems to have reference.

Now, these four kingdoms (according to the truth infallibly to be demonstrated, if need were, and agreeable both to the ancient opinion of the Jewish Church, whom they most concerned, and to the most ancient and universal opinion of Christians derived from the times of the apostles, until now, of late time, some have questioned it) are,—1. The Babylonians. 2. That of the Medes and Persians. 3. The Greek. 4. The Roman. In which quaternary of kingdoms, as the Roman, being the last of the four, is the last kingdom; so are the times thereof those *last times* we seek for; during which times (saith Dan. chap. ii. 44)—*The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor left unto another people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all those kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.* Which is figured by a stone hewn out of the mountain without hands, before the times of the image were yet spent; which stone at length smote the image upon his feet of iron and clay, and so utterly destroyed it; that done, the stone that smote the image upon the feet became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. The meaning of all which is, that

in the last times, or under the times of the last kingdom (the Roman), should the kingdom of Christ appear in the world, as we see it hath done.

And this is that which the apostle saith, Hebrews i. 2, *God in these last days*, or last times, *hath spoken to us by his Son:* and St. Peter, 1 Ep. i. 20, that he was *foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times.* This is that fulness of time whereof the apostle speaks, Gal. iv. 4, *When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman*, and Ephes. i. 9, 10, *Having made known to us the mystery of his will —That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ.* Agreeable unto all which is that, Heb. ix. 26, *Christ hath once appeared,* in the end of times*, or ages, *to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* Where these *last times, fulness of times*, and *conclusion of ages*, are nothing else but the times of the fourth kingdom, whose times are the last period of Daniel's four, the fulness of the Prophetical Chronology, and conclusion of the sacred kalendar. During these times Christ was looked for, and accordingly came and reigned; whose kingdom shall at length abolish the brittle remainder of this Romish state, according to the other part of the prophecy, when the *fulness of the Gentiles shall come in*, and our Lord subdue all his enemies under his feet, and at the last even death itself.

* ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων.

Having thus found what times are termed *the last times* in general, let us now see if we can discover which are the *latter times* of these last times, or the latter times in special, which are those *latter times** in my text: which will not be hard to do. For if the last times in general are all the times of the fourth kingdom, then must our latter times, as a part thereof, needs be the latter times of that kingdom. Let us, therefore, again to our prophetical kalendar, and survey Daniel's description of the fourth or Roman kingdom, as it is chapter vii., from verse 19, where we shall soon find the latter times thereof to be that period of a time, times and half a time, during which that prodigious horn, with eyes like a man, and a mouth speaking great things, should make war with the saints, prevail against them, and wear them out, and think to change times and laws, until the judgment should sit, and his dominion be taken away; and in him that long-lived beast finally be destroyed, and his body given to the burning flame (verse 11). For this hornish sovereignty is the last scene of that long tragedy, and the conclusion of the fourth beast; and, therefore, the times thereof are those latter times, whereof the Spirit spake expressly, that in them there should be an apostasy from the Christian faith.

* ὑστέροι καιροὶ.

CHAPTER XIII.

Two inquiries concerning the latter times.—1. *What durance they are to be of.*—*Answ. That the times of the Antichristian state are to last forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty days.*—*That hereby cannot be meant three single years and a half, proved by several particulars.*—*Inquiry* 2. *When they begin.*—*Answ. That they take their beginning from the mortal wound of the imperial sovereignty of Rome, or the ruin of the Roman empire.*—*This proved from the Apocalypse and* 2 *Thess.* ii., *whereby "That which letteth,"* the Fathers generally understand the Roman empire.*—*The same further proved from Dan.* vii. *that by the little horn is meant Antichrist, or the Man of Sin, (and not Antiochus Epiphanes,) was the judgment of the most ancient fathers.*

CONCERNING these times thus found, we will now further inquire, *First*, What durance they may be of. *Secondly*, When they take beginning, and by what mark their beginning may be known.

For the first, we will make no question but these are the selfsame times whereof St. John speaks, telling us that the Church should be in the wilderness a *time, times, and half a time;* the same with those forty-two months wherein St. John's restored beast should domineer, and play the selfsame reeks which Daniel's hornish tyrant doth; the same time with those forty-two months during which the Church is *trodden down of the*

* τὸ κατέχον.

Gentiles: lastly, the same time with 1260 days, during which the witnesses of Christ *prophesy in sackcloth.* For a time, times, and half a time, or a year, two years, and a half, are forty-two months; and forty-two months make 1260 days.

If, therefore, we can find the continuance and beginning of any of these, we have found the continuance and beginning of them all.

For the duration and length of them, they must imply some definite time, because the Scripture follows that use of speech, and useth no number indefinitely, but those which the use of speech had made such, as 7, 10, 1000. But mixed and compound numbers, as these are, viz., $3\frac{1}{2}$, 42, 1260, are neither in the Hebrew, nor, I think, in any other tongue, used indefinitely.

Our adversaries would have them literally understood for three single years and a half, as though it were an history and not a prophecy. But, besides the use of prophecy to reckon days for years, I think it would trouble any man to conceive how so many things as should be performed in this time, should be done in three single years and a half. 1. Ten kingdoms founded at the same time with the beast. 2. People, and multitudes of nations and tongues to serve and obey him. 3. To make war with the saints and overcome them. 4. To cause all that dwell upon the earth to worship him. 5. Babylon to ride the beast so long that all nations shall drink of the wine of her fornication, all the kings of the earth commit fornication with her,

yea, the merchants and all those that had ships in the sea to grow rich by trading with her. Methinks all these things should ask much more than three years' work, or four either. To which I add, moreover, that that king, state of government, sovereignty, or seigniory, or what you will, of the beast, under which the whore should ride him, followeth immediately upon a former, which in comparison is said to continue but *a short space.* Rev. xvii. 10. But if the Antichristian state shall continue but three years and a half, literally taken, how short must the time of that foregoing king or sovereignty be, which should occasion the Holy Ghost to insert so singular a note of the difference thereof from that which followed, that it should continue but a short space? Doth not this imply that the next state (wherein the whore should ride the beast) was to continue a long space? Therefore, three years and a half, historically taken, cannot be the time of the Church's apostasy, and the Antichristian sovereignty of Rome; and if it cannot be taken historically, it must be taken prophetically, every day for a year; and so 1260 days, counted so many years, shews the extent of these Latter Times to be 1260 years.

Now for the second thing proposed, the beginning of these Latter Times; St. John tells us in the Revelation, that his blasphemous beast of forty-two months' continuance should succeed upon the mortal wound of the Cæsarean or imperial sovereignty of Rome; and Rev. xvii. 12, 13, the idolatrous beast which carries the great

whore upon his back, should have a plurality of kings start up at the same time with him, who should agree to submit their power and kingdom unto him. And would not he also in the same chapter have us to take notice, that the Antichristian state of the beast which was to come should be the next to that of the Cæsars which then reigned? For the angel there tells him, that the state of the beast wherein the whore should ride him, which then was not in being, but should afterwards ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into perdition, that this state or head of the beast should succeed so immediately upon the sixth state or head, (viz., the Cæsarean then reigning) that howsoever for some respect it might be called an eighth, yet should it in very deed be but the seventh. For how could it be otherwise, when the beast in the vision had but seven heads and no more?—See vers. 8, 10, 11.

Agreeable to this is St. Paul's epoch, 2 Thess. ii. 7, who tells us, that as soon as the imperial sovereignty of Rome, which then hindered, should be taken out of the way, then should *that wicked one be revealed.* Thus the Fathers generally expound it. Hence was that custom in the Church, in the most ancient times of it, to pray in their liturgy for the lasting of the Roman empire; that so Antichrist might be long a-coming. —Tertul. Apol. cap. 32 and 39. Ad. Scap. cap. 2. Upon this ground St. Jerome, when he heard of the taking of Rome by Alaric, the Goth, presently expected the coming of

Antichrist. "He who hindered is taken out of the way; and we consider not that Antichrist is at hand."*—The same in his preface, lib. 8. Comment. in Ezek. "My mind is refreshed, and for the present forgets the woful calamities that this last age labours with, groaning and travailing in pain, till he who hinders, be taken out of the way, and the feet of the iron statue be broken to pieces by reason of the brittleness of the clayey toes. The world goes to ruin, and yet the haughty neck does not bend,† &c." Thus he, "after that the most glorious light in all the world was put out, and the head of the Roman empire was cut off, and so the whole world was destroyed in the destruction of that one city,"‡—as he elsewhere deplores that woful calamity, Pref. in lib. 1, Comment. in Ezek.

Answerable to that which St. John told us, Daniel's kalendar also informs us, that the hornish tyrant who was to act the Latter Times should then begin to appear, when ten kings should arise in the fourth kingdom. For the ten horns which at the last he espied upon the beast's head,

* Ad Gerontiam de Monogamia: qui tenebat, (saith he,) de medio fit, et non intelligimus Antichristum appropinquare.

† Pascitur animus, et obliviscitur seculi calamitatum, quod in extremo fine jam positum congemiscit et parturit, donec qui tenet, de medio fiat, et pedes statuæ quondam ferreæ fragilitate digitorum fictilium conterantur: cadit mundus, et cervix erecta non flectitur, &c.

‡ Postquam clarissimum terrarum omnium Lumen extinctum est, imo Romani imperii truncatum caput, et in una urbe totus orbis interiit.

dwell entirely and bodily."* Who these three kings were which this horn displanted to make himself elbow-room, you shall hear more anon. But I will not conceal that I have heard of another exposition, which fits our turn for the beginning of the apostasy no less than that of the Fathers: namely, that by ten kingdoms may be meant the full plurality of the Roman provinces, so much whereof as three is of ten should have the imperial power rooted out of them, and fall under the dominion of the Antichristian Horn, who should act the sovereignty of the Latter Times, or the last sovereignty of that kingdom. Now it is most true that the Pope's patriarchdom in the west holds just that scantling of the ancient territory of the Roman Empire, which a man may judge by his eyes or compasses in a map: and yet I prefer the other exposition before it.

To come to an issue: it is apparent, by all that hath been said, that these Latter Times, with that wicked sovereignty which should domineer in them, were to take beginning from the wound, the fall, the ruin, the rending in pieces or rooting-up, of the imperial sovereignty of the city of Rome. When that city should cease to be the lap of that sovereignty which the

* Ergo dicamus quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt.—In consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros reges, qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant, et undecimum surrecturum esse regem parvulum, qui tres reges de decem regibus superaturus sit, in quo totus Satanas habitaturus sit corporaliter.

Cæsars once held over the nations, and many new upstart kings should appear in the place and territory of that once-one empire; then should the apostasy be seen, and the Latter Times, with that Wicked One, make their entrance. Now in what age this fell out, I think no man can be ignorant, who hath but a little skill in history.

CHAPTER XIV.

That we are not to reckon the latter times, or the times of the empire's ruin, and the apostasy attending, from the full height thereof.—This illustrated from other computations in Scripture.—The three main degrees of the Roman empire's ruin.—Who are those three kings whom the little horn (or Antichrist) is said, in Dan. vii., *to have displanted or depressed, to advance himself.—About what time saint-worship began in the Church.—That we are not too curiously to inquire from which of the three degrees of the empire's ruin the apostatical or Latter Times take their beginning.*

But you will say, The imperial sovereignty of Old Rome fell not all at once, but had divers steps and degrees of ruin, so that the doubt will be, notwithstanding, from which of these steps of the fall thereof these latter times must be reckoned.

I answer, From any of them. For as the imperial sovereignty fell by degrees, so the apostasy under the lattermost sovereignty grew up also by degrees; and for every degree which the ruinous empire decayed, was the rising Son of perdition a degree advanced. Secondly, all the main and evident degrees of the empire's ruin fell in the compass of an age; and the knowledge and observation of that age only, within which the times of this fall are comprehended, was sufficient both to warn them who then lived, that that which

should come was then a-coming, and to inform us who now live that it is already come.

Now, which were these main and evident degrees of the empire's falling, and at what time, I will tell you as soon as I have removed an usual mistake in this business, which is to reckon the times of the empire's ruin, and so likewise of the apostasy attending it, only from the ἀκμὴ, or full height thereof. But this is too much against reason, and not agreeable to the course we otherwise use in the like. For as, when we reckon the age of a man, we reckon not from the time since he came to man's estate, but from the time of his birth, so should we do here for the times of the Man of sin. I say not, we should begin to count his age from his conception, for that we use not in other things, but from the time he was first *editus in lucem*, when he first began to appear in the world: and so likewise the fall of the empire and the apostasy, not from the time they were consummate, but from the time they first evidently appeared. As, therefore, I hold their opinion the best and most agreeable to truth, who begin the seventy years of the Jewish captivity in Babylon, not from the consummation thereof under Zedekiah, when the city and temple were utterly razed, for that is impossible, (there being not sixty years in all between the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar and the last of Cyrus,) but from the beginning thereof under Jehoiakim, eighteen years before, or at the most but from Jehoiachin: so are these Latter Times of the Roman state to begin when the empire first began

to fall, and not when it was utterly rooted up. (i) Take, for another example, the computation of the time allotted to the calamity of the Jews under Antiochus, which I the rather allege, because he is commonly counted for a type of Antichrist. The beginning of that 2,300 evenings and mornings, or six years and somewhat more than a quarter, which that calamity was to continue, from the beginning thereof until the Temple should again be cleansed, Dan. viii. 13, 14, was not to be reckoned from the height thereof, when "the daily sacrifice should be taken away," (for thence it is but three years, 1 Mac. i. 54, &c., with chap. iv. 52,) but from the beginning of the trangression which occasioned this desolation, and is described 1 Mac. i. 11, &c. So likewise the end of the kingdom of the Greeks, wherein this calamity was to happen, is not to be counted only then, when Æmilius the Consul had quite finished the conquest of Macedon, (for this points out only the height of that calamity,) but from the beginning of that last fatal war, which put an end to that kingdom; which was about some three years and a-half before, and agrees with the beginning of the "transgression of desolation," as the finishing of the conquest doth with "the taking away of the daily sacrifice."

But, leaving this, let us return again and see which were those main and evident degrees of the empire's downfall, and when they befell, which, I suppose, may not be unfitly be sampled by those of the Babylonish captivity.

As, therefore, the Babylonish captivity had

three steps or degrees, the first in the days of Jehoiakim, when Daniel went captive; the second under Jehoiachin or Jechonias, when Ezekiel went captive; and the last under Zedekiah, when the temple and city were wholly razed and consumed, so omitting the political change under Constantine, the chief and principal moments of the ruin of the empire by the sword (and by the word, the Beast had its deadly wound, Apocal. xiii. 14,) may fitly be reduced unto three:—

1. The first was presently after the death of Julian, the last of heathen emperors, about the year 365, ominously marked with that universal, stupendous, and never-but-then-sampled earthquake, whereby the waters of the sea were rolled out of their channels, and left ships hanging upon the tops of houses. From this time forwards, all the nations with one consent, seem to have conspired the ruin of the empire. Now that terrible and fatal storm of the nations of the north, Allemans, Sarmatians, Quades, Picts, Scots, and Saxons, especially the Goths, began to break in upon it; almost without intermission harrying, burning, wasting, destroying the most part of the provinces thereof, almost for forty-five years together. And, to mend the matter, the Goths soon after their coming were admitted as inhabitants, and dispersed as free citizens into the bowels and heart of the empire, advanced to be commanders, and bore the greatest sway in their armies; by which fatal error the empire received her bane, and the Romans were no longer masters of their own strength, which they quickly and often re-

pented; but even that cost them dear, when they had, indeed, eyes to see it, but never ability to mend it. This was the first degree of the empire's ruin.

2. The second was about the year 410, when Alaricus the Goth sacked Rome itself, the proud lady of the world; when, as St. Jerome saith, "The city which had conquered the whole world was itself taken, being undone by famine before it was by the sword, insomuch that there were but few left to be taken prisoners." * And from this very year the plurality of kings foretold of began to come upon the stage; five or six new kingdoms presently appearing within the territories of the empire,—of the Goths, of the Burgundians, and though somewhat later, of the Franks, in Gallia; of the Suevians and Alans, and of the Vandals, in Spain; and, as Sigonius thinks, of the Huns, in Pannonia; certainly they could not be much later than this very year. But this number of kings we will leave till they be better increased, as continually they did. And thus you see the second degree of the ruin of the empire.

3. The third was about the year 455, presently upon the death of the third Valentinian, the last (as Sleidan well observed) of the emperors of the west, and consequently of the ancient Rome; then when Genseric the Vandal took the city the second time, fired it, and spoiled it of all the

* Capiebatur urbs quæ totum cepit orbem, imò fame periit antequam gladio, et vix pauci qui caperentur inventi sunt.

goodly and glorious ornaments which Alaric had spared, amongst which were the golden and silver vessels of the Temple of Jerusalem, brought thither by Titus; all which, with an innumerable multitude of Roman captives, he carried away with him. Now was the prediction, which Varro reports that Vectius Valens, the augur, made of twelve vultures to Romulus the founder, that his city should continue 1200 years, fulfilled, and those years newly expired. And, which is more to be heeded, now was the plurality of kings lately risen in the ancient territory of the empire, as Daniel and St. John had prophesied, increased unto the full number of ten, which, together with the provinces wherein they were seated, and the names of the kings which reigned the next year after the city was taken, are these which follow:—

ANNO DOMINI 456.

Kingdoms of the	Provinces.	Reigning Kings' names.
1. Britons . . . } 2. Saxons . . . }	Britain	{ Vortimer Hengist
3. Franks . . . } 4. Burgundians* }	Gaul	{ Childeric Gunderic
5. Wisigoths	South of Gaul, between the Rhine, Loire, and sea; and part of Spain	Theodoric

* A. 526. This kingdom of the Burgundians was subdued by the Franks: but to fill up the number, that of the Ostrogoths became two, by the coming of the Longobards into Pannonia the same time.

Kingdoms of the	Provinces.	Reigning Kings' names.
6. Suevians and Alans	Spain, in Gallicia, and Portugal . . .	Riciarius
7. Vandals . .	Africa, but first in Spain	Genseric
8. Almans * . .	Germany, in Rhaetia	Sumanus
9. Ostrogoths † whom the Longobards succeeded .	Pannonia, where they subdued the Huns	Theodemir
10. Greeks‡(k)	Residue of Empire	Marcianus

Thus was the empire divided and shared A.D. 456, the year after Rome was sacked by Genseric, and the offspring of these nations, through many alterations, partly by the inconstancy of human things, unions and disunions, partly by the further enlargement of the Christian faith, are the body of most of the kingdoms and states of Christendom at this day. Three of these kings, saith Daniel, should the Antichristian Horn depress and displant, to advance himself;

* This kingdom became one with part of the kingdom of the Heruli, 475, during their short reign in Italy.

† The Longobards succeeded the Ostrogoths first in Pannonia, on the death of Theodoric of Verona, anno 526. Then in Italy, called in by Narses discontented, soon after he had destroyed the kingdom of the Goths.

‡ The empire of ancient Rome finished, that of the Greeks is but one of the kingdoms whereinto it was divided.

which three are those whose dominions extended into Italy, and so stood in his light.

1. That of the *Greeks*, whose Emperor, Leo Isaurus, for the quarrel of images, he excommunicated, and revolted his subjects of Italy from their allegiance.

2. That of the *Longobards*, successors of the Ostrogoths, whose kingdom he caused, by the aid of the Franks, to be wholly ruined, thereby to get the exarchate of Ravenna; which, since their revolt from the Greeks, they were seized on, for a patrimony to St. Peter.

3. The last was the kingdom of the Franks itself, continued in the Empire of Germany, whose Emperors, from the time of Henry the Fourth, he excommunicated, deposed, and trampled under his feet, and never suffered them to live in rest, till he made them not only quit their interest in elections of Popes and investitures of Bishops, but that remainder of jurisdiction in Italy, wherewith, together with the dignity of the Roman name, he had once infeoffed their predecessors.

These are the kings, by displanting, or, as the Vulgate hath, by humbling of whom, the Pope got elbow-room by degrees, and advanced himself to the height of temporal majesty and absolute greatness, which made him so terrible in the world. (1)

This third blow, therefore, I suppose, is to be counted the last of the ruin of the empire; the imperial power of the ancient Rome, until the Pope, some 345 years after, revived the name,

henceforth ceasing. For as for those who yet some twenty years after our date, scuffled for that name, one of them deposing another, they were, indeed, but shadows of Cæsars, and, as it were, strugglings with the pangs of death, until, with Augustulus, it gave up the ghost. Yea, it is to be observed that two of them, Avitus, the very next, and Glycerius, being deposed from the empire, were made Bishops, the one of Placentia or Piacenza, the other of Portus; as a sign, perhaps, that the Emperor of Rome henceforth should be a Bishop, and a Bishop the Emperor.

To conclude, therefore, with the application of our apostle's prediction, whether the Christian apostasy, in worshipping new demon-gods, began not with the first of these degrees, notably increased with the second, and was established by the last, I leave you to judge, when you shall have surveyed the monuments and records of those times.

It is commonly and truly affirmed by our ecclesiastical antiquaries that, before the year 360, there is no word to be found of the invocation of saints glorified, or worshipping their relics, to which I add, No! nor of any miracles done by them. But, presently after that year, when our first date of the empire's ruin began, search, and you shall find. I spare to name the authors, not willing to discover the nakedness of the Fathers, but whoso reads them will admire to see so truly verified what the Spirit foretold should be in the Latter Times. And, to make an end, if any shall think this speculation of

times to be a needless curiosity, I desire him to remember how our Saviour reproved the Jews for neglect hereof, Matt. xvi. 3, "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" or, as St. Luke xii. 56, "How is it that ye do not discern this time?" They, through neglecting the *signs of the times*, when Christ came, received him not. How many, through ignorance of these Latter Times, when the apostasy appeared, eschewed it not!

From which of these three beginnings of the Apostolical Times, or whether from some other moment within or between them, the Almighty will reckon His computation of these ὑστέροι καιροὶ, which, ended, shall finish the days of the Man of Sin, I curiously inquire not, but leave unto him who is Lord of times and seasons. Nor do I think that the Jews themselves could certainly tell from which of their three captivities to begin that reckoning of LXX years, whose end should bring their return from Babylon, until the event assured them thereof.

CHAPTER XV.

That Daniel's seventy weeks are a lesser kalendar of times. —That in reference to these weeks must those phrases in the Epistles to the converted Jews, viz., "The last hour or time," "The end of all things," "The day approaching," &c., be expounded of the end of the Jewish state and service at the expiry of the seventy weeks.—That the apostles were not so mistaken as to believe the end of the world should be in their days, proved against Baronius and other Romanists.

I SHOULD now presently come to speak of the fourth particular which I observed in this verse. But, because in this discourse of times, beside the Great Kalendar of Times I spake of so much, there was some mention of a Lesser Kalendar, viz., of Daniel's seventy weeks, give me leave to note some places of Scripture which I suppose to have reference thereto; for the better clearing, not only of our former Discourse, but of some scruples that might trouble our minds, when mention is made of an *end* then supposed near, though the world hath so many hundred years since continued, and no end thereof is yet come.

Know, therefore, that these seventy weeks of Daniel are a little provincial kalendar, containing the time that the legal worship and Jewish state was to continue, from the rebuilding of the Sanctuary under Darius Nothus, until the final destruction thereof, when the kalendar should

expire; within the space whereof their commonwealth and city should be restored, and, sixty-two weeks after that, the Messias be slain for sin; and, at the end of the whole seventy, their city and temple again destroyed, and their commonwealth utterly dissolved. To these weeks, therefore, whose computation so especially concerns the Jews, is reference made in those epistles which are written to the Christian Churches of that nation, whether living in Jewry, or dispersed abroad. Such is St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews; both of St. Peter's to those of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia; the Epistle of St. James to the twelve tribes; and likewise the first Epistle of St. John; which though the salutation expresseth not, yet it may appear, both because Peter, James, and John were all three apostles of the circumcision, and from that passage, ii. 2, "Christ Jesus is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world;" that is, not for the sins of us only who are Jews, but for the sins of the Gentiles also. And doth not the name of General or Catholic Epistle, given to this, as well as to those of St. James and St. Peter, imply thus much? For it cannot be thus called because written to all Christians indefinitely and generally, since the contrary expressly appears in that of St. James; but because this, as well as the rest, was written to those of the circumcision, who were not a people confined to any one certain city or region, but dispersed through every nation; as we read

in Acts ii. 5, &c., that at the feast of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost came down upon the apostles, "there were sojourning at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven; Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, and strangers of Rome, Jews, and proselytes," that is, Jews by race, and Jews by religion, &c. For we must not mistake those numbered here to be Gentiles, but Israelites, both of the ten tribes captivated by Shalmaneser, and of the other two; some of whom never returned from Babylon, but lived still in Mesopotamia: but of those who returned great multitudes were dispersed afterwards in Egypt, Libya, and many other provinces, before the time of our Saviour's appearing in the flesh. So that the apostles of the circumcision had their province, for largeness, not much inferior to those of the Gentiles.

But I come to note the places I spake of. And, first, out of the forenamed Epistle of St. John, where, from that prediction of our Saviour's in the Gospel, that the arising of false prophets should be one of the near signs of the nigh-approaching end of the Jewish state, the Apostle thus refers to it, "Little children, this is the last hour:* and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now there are many Antichrists, whereby we know that is the time." Here, by "the last time," I suppose no other thing to be meant but the near expiring of Daniel's seventy

* Ἐσχάτη ὥρα.

weeks, and with it the approaching end of the Jewish commonwealth: and why might not this Epistle be written in the last week, at the beginning whereof Jesus Ananias began that woful cry, Wo unto Jerusalem and the Temple? (Josephus' Wars, b. 7.) By *many Antichrists,*† are meant no other but false prophets, or counter-prophets to the Great Prophet, pretending an unction and commission from Heaven, as he had, to teach the world some new revelation and doctrine. For the name, *Christ*, implies the unction of prophecy as well as the unction of a kingdom, and accordingly the name *Antichrist:* and therefore the Syriac here turns it "False Christs," that is, such as should falsely pretend some extraordinary unction of prophecy like unto him. And the coming of such as these our Saviour, in St. Matthew's Gospel (a Gospel for the Hebrews) makes one of the last signs ushering in the destruction of Jerusalem: and if the harmony of this prophecy in the three Evangelists be well considered, there was no more to come but the compassing Jerusalem with armies. Well, therefore, might St. John, when he saw so many anti-prophets spring up, say, *Hereby we know that it is the last time.* (m)

Again, because the desolation of the Jewish state and temple would be a great confirmation of the Christian faith; therefore the believing Jews, whom nothing could so much stagger as the standing glory of that temple and religion, are encouraged by the nearness of that time of ex-

† Πολλοι Αντιχριστοι.

pectation when so great a confirmation of their faith of the Messias already come should appear, Heb. x. 23, 25, *Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching;* namely, that day in which you shall be sufficiently confirmed. So I take the 35th and 37th verses of the same chapter, "Cast not away your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward: for ye have need of patience—For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." What *He* is this, but even He whom Daniel says, "The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." (Dan. ix. 26.) For even as the destruction of Papal Rome would be a great confirmation of the Reformed Christian who hath forsaken the communion of that religion, the continuation and supposed stability of the glory thereof being that wherewith their proctors endeavour most to shake and stagger us; so was the destruction of the Jewish state and temple to be unto those Jews who had withdrawn themselves from that body and religion whereof they once had been, to embrace the new faith of the Messiah preached by the apostles. (n) For if, at the end of the seventy weeks approaching, the legal sanctuary were razed, and the Jewish State dissolved, then it would be apparent indeed that Messiah was already come and slain for sin; because this was infallibly to come to pass within the compass, and before the expiration of those seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, allotted for the last continuance of that city and

sanctuary, when it should be restored after the captivity of Babylon. Not without cause, therefore, doth St. Peter, in his Second Epistle, say to the Christian Jews,— *We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.* Yea and besides, because Jesus, as well as Daniel, had prophesied of the approaching desolation of that city and temple, mentioning all the signs that were to usher it:—if the event, when time came, should fall out accordingly, then must Jesus of Nazareth, who foretold the foregoing signs thereof, be approved as a true prophet, by whom of a truth the Lord had spoken.

Now for the last place that I mean to allege. Because the fall and shock of that state might shake the whole nation, wheresoever dispersed, unless God spared the Christians, and made them alone happy in that woful day; or rather, because Christ had foretold that one of the next fore-runners thereof should be a general persecution of Christians, as it happened under Nero: therefore the remembrance of the end of these seventy weeks, so near the expiring, was a good caution to all the Christian Jews to watch and pray. To this sense, therefore, I take that of Peter, 1 Peter iv. 7, "The end of all approacheth: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer:" * that is, the end of all your commonwealth, legal worship, temple, and service, is now within a few years: be ye therefore sober,

* Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικε, κ.τ.λ.

and watch unto prayer, that ye may be the more happy in that day of vengeance and wrath upon our nation. Neither need we wonder that this "desolation" should be called "the end," for our Saviour himself taught them so to speak, in his prophecy concerning it, as may appear if we consider the antithesis in St. Luke, chap. xxi. v. 9, "Ye shall hear of wars and commotions, but the end is not by and by." Verse 29, "But when ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

And thus much I thought to add to my former Discourse of Latter Times, lest, through ignorance thereof, we might incline to that little better than blasphemous conceit, which Baronius by name, and some other of Rome's followers, have taken up, viz., That the apostles, in such-like passages as we have noted, were mistaken, as believing that the end of the world should have been in their own time, God of purpose so ordering it, to cause in them a greater measure of zeal and contempt of worldly things. An opinion, I think, not well beseeming a Christian:

For, first, whatsoever we imagine the apostles might here conceive in their private opinions as men, yet we must know that the Holy Ghost, by whose instinct they wrote the Scriptures, is the Spirit of truth; and therefore what is there affirmed must be true, though the penman himself understood it not.

Second, it was not possible the apostles should expect the end of the world to be in their own time, when they knew so many things were to

come to pass before it as could not be fulfilled in so short a time. As, 1st, the desolation of Jerusalem, and that not till the seventy weeks were expired. 2d, The Jews to be carried captives over all nations, and Jerusalem to be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled. 3d, That in the meantime the Roman empire must be ruined, and that which hindered taken out of the way. 4th. That, after that was done, the Man of Sin should be revealed, and domineer his time in the temple and Church of God. 5th, After all this, viz., when the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, that Israel should be received again to mercy. 6th, That Christ should reign in his Church on earth so long till he had put down all rule, all authority, and power, and subjected all his enemies under his feet, before he should subdue the last enemy, which is Death, and surrender his kingdom into the hands of his Father. 7th. That the time should be so long, that in the last days should come scoffers, saying, "Where is the promise of his coming?" How is it possible they should imagine the day of doom to be so near, when all these things must first come to pass, and not one of them was yet fulfilled? And how could the expectation of this day be made a ground of exhortation, and a motive to watchfulness and prayer, as though it could suddenly and unawares surprise them, which had so many wonderful alterations to forego it, and none of them yet come to pass? (o)

I have spoken hitherto of what was revealed

to all the apostles in general. But if we take St. John apart from the rest, and consider what was afterward revealed to him in Patmos, we shall find in his apocalyptical visions, besides other times more obscurely intimated, an express prophecy of no less than a thousand years, which, whatever it mean, cannot be a small time, and must be fulfilled in this world, and not in the world to come. Notwithstanding all this, I make no question but, even in the apostles' times, many of the believing Gentiles, mistaking the apostles' admonitions to the Jews of the end of their state approaching, thought the end of the whole world and the day of the Lord had been also near; whom, therefore, St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii., beseeches to be better informed, because that day should not come until the apostasy came first, and the Man of sin were revealed.

CHAPTER XVI.

The fourth particular, viz., the warrant or proof of this prophecy.—When the Spirit speaks expressly, and when by secret instinct or inspiration.—That the Spirit foretold the Great Apostasy expressly in Dan. xi. 36—39.*—An exact translation of these verses both in Latin and English.—The chief difficulties in them explained, and incidentally other places of Scripture.—The different opinions of Junius and Graserus about verse* xxxviii.*—The Author's translation free from the inconveniences of both.—A particular explication of "Mahoz," and "Mahuzzim:" that hereby are meant fortresses, bulwarks, as also protectors, guardians, defenders, &c.—How fitly this title is applicable to angels and saints, accounted to be such by those that worshipped them.*

Now I come to the fourth particular of this prophecy, the warrant or proof thereof. The Spirit hath foretold it ῥητῶς, or in express words, in some place or other of Divine writ. The Spirit told Peter, Acts x. 19, "Behold, three men seek thee." The Spirit said, Acts xiii. 2, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." The Spirit forbade St. Paul to preach in Asia. The Spirit said that the Jews should bind St. Paul at Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 11. But in all these the Spirit spake not ῥητῶς, for these things were nowhere written; and, therefore, what it spake it spake ἀῤῥητῶς, only by secret instinct or inspiration. But that which the Spirit speaks in the written Word, that it speaks ῥητῶς, *verbatim*, expressly. If, therefore, concerning this apostasy of Christian believers,

to be in the Latter Times, the Spirit speaketh ῥητως, then is it to be found somewhere in the Old Testament, for there alone the Spirit could be said to speak ῥητῶς, or *verbatim*, in the apostles' time. Having, therefore, so good a hint given us, let us see if we can find where the Spirit speaketh of this matter so expressly.

There are three main things in this our apostle's prediction, whereof I find the Spirit to have spoken ῥητως, or in express words, and that in the prophecy of Daniel: 1, of these Last or Latter Times; 2, of the new worship of Demons in them; 3, of a prohibition of marriage to accompany them. As for the first of these, the Latter Times, Daniel (as you have heard before) expressly names them "A time, times, and half a time,"* being those last times of the last kingdom, wherein the hornish tyrant should make war with the saints, and prevail against them. For the second, a worship of new demons or demi-gods, with the profession of the name of Christ, you will perhaps think it strange if I should shew it ῥητῶς· but if I do, it was the appendix of hindering or debarring marriage, mentioned in the next verses, which as a thread led me the way to the end of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, where I found it; and in a place, too, very suspicious, being taken, I think, by almost all the ancients, for a prophecy of Antichrist, yea, and so expounded by the greatest part of our own, though with much variety of reading and application. (p)

* Καιρὸς, καιροὶ, καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ.

But hear the words themselves in vv. 36—39, of that eleventh chapter of Daniel, translated, as I think, *ῥητῶς*, *verbatim*, without any wresting or straining the Hebrew text. They are a description of the last or Roman kingdom, and the several states thereof, conquering nations, persecuting Christians, false-worshipping Christ. The words are these:—

DANIEL XI. 36—39.

36 Then a King shall do according to his will, and shall exalt and magnify himself above every God.

Yea, against the God of gods shall he speak marvellous things, and shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished, for the determined time shall be fulfilled.

37 Then he shall not regard the Gods of his ancestors, nor shall he regard the desire of women, no, nor any God: but he shall magnify himself above all.

38. For to [or together with] God, in his seat, he shall honour *Mahuzzims*; even together with that God whom his ancestors knew not, shall he honour [them] with gold, and with silver, and with precious stones, and with pleasant things.

39 And he shall make the holds of the *Mahuzzims* withal [or jointly] to the foreign God, whom acknowledging, he shall increase with honour, and shall cause them to rule over many, and shall distribute the earth for a reward.

1. Now, for the understanding of this prophecy, we must take notice that the prophet Daniel, at the beginning of these verses, leaves off the Greek kingdom with Antiochus, of whom he was speaking before, and turns to the Roman: the reason being, because after Antiochus, in whose time Macedonia, whence that kingdom sprung, with all the rest of Greece, came under the Roman obedience, the third kingdom comes

no more in the holy reckoning; Daniel himself calling the time of Antiochus's reign the latter end of the Greek kingdom, chap. viii. 23, and, as I take it, he intimates the same in this chapter, in the verse immediately foregoing these we have now to deal withal. From thenceforward, therefore, the Roman power succeeds in the account of the Great Kalendar of Times.

2. Under the name *king* we must understand the whole Roman state, under what kind of Government soever. For the Hebrews use *king* for *kingdom*, and *kingdom* for *any government, state*, or *polity* in the world. For the Devil, in the Gospel, is said to have shown Christ all the *kingdoms* of the world, monarchies, aristocracies, democracies, or what other kind soever.

3. Where it is said that this King should exalt himself above every God, nothing is thereby meant but the greatness and generality of his conquests and prevailings. And the reason of that phrase or manner of speech should seem to be, because, in the times of Paganism, every city and country was supposed to have their proper and peculiar Gods, which were deemed as their guardians and protectors: whence in the Scripture, according to the language of that time, we may observe a threefold use of speech:—

First, the nations themselves are expressed and implied under the names of their Gods. The Israelites were called "The people of Jehovah." So are the Moabites "The people of Chemosh."—(Numb. xxi. 29.) The Lord threatened (Deut. iv. 28, and xxviii. 36 and 64. Jer. xvi. 13) to

scatter Israel among the nations, from one end of the earth even to another, and that there they should serve other Gods day and night, Gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither they nor their fathers had known; (p) that is, they should serve them, not religiously, but politically, inasmuch as they were to become slaves and vassals to idolatrous nations, even such idolaters as neither they nor their fathers had ever heard of. For as for a religious service of idols, the Jews were never so free as in their captivity, as we see by experience this day; but with the service of bondage they may be said politically to have been the vassals of idols, as being in bondage to the servants of other Gods. As a Christian taken by the Turk may, in the like sense, be said to come in bondage and be a slave to Mahomet, for a slave to the servants is, in a sense, slave to their master. Let it also be considered whether that of David (1 Sam. xxvi. 19,) be not to be expounded according to this notion, "They have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go, serve other Gods:" that is, banished me into a nation of another religion.

Secondly, the exploits of the nations are said to be done by their Gods; even as we, by like privilege of speech, ascribe unto our kings what is done by the people under them. Thus (2 Chron. xxviii. 33) the Gods of Damascus are said to have smitten Ahaz: *He sacrificed to the Gods of Damascus that smote him; and he said, Because the Gods of Syria help them, there-*

fore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me. In Jer. li. 44, it is said of the dominion of Babylon, that the nations flowed together unto Bel, and that he had swallowed up their wealth, which the Lord threatened there to bring forth again out of his mouth.

Thirdly, and that most frequently of all others, what is attempted against the nations is said to be attempted against their Gods; even as generals bear the name not only of the exploits, but also of the disadvantages, of the armies led by them, so here the Gods are said to receive the affronts, defeatures, and discomfitures, given to the people under their patronage. Rabshakeh vaunts, in his master's name, (2 Kings xviii. 33,) "Hath any of the Gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of Assyria? Where are the Gods of Hamath and of Arpad? where are the Gods of Sepharvaim?" Isaiah (xlvi. 1, 2,) prophesieth thus of the taking of Babylon by Cyrus: "Bel boweth down; Nebo stoopeth. They could not deliver the burthen, but they are themselves gone into captivity." In the like strain prophesieth Jeremiah, chap. l. 2, "Babylon is taken; Bel is confounded; Merodach is broken in pieces; her idols are confounded," &c. And again, (Jer. li. 44,) "I will punish Bel in Babylon, and I will bring out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed up, and the nations shall not flow together any more unto him; yea, the wall of Babylon shall fall." The same prophet saith of Moab's captivity, chap xlviii. 7, "Thou shalt be taken, and Chemosh shall go into captivity with

his priests and his princes together." Moab likewise, in his affronts and derision of Israel, is said to have magnified himself against the Lord. According to which manner of speech, the success and prevailing of the Roman, in the advancing his dominion and subduing every nation under him, is here expressed by his exalting and magnifying himself above every God. This I suppose to be the ground of that manner of speech; though if any had rather, as others do, take Gods here for the kings and potentates of the earth, it will, I confess, come all to one purpose.

4. By the Gods of their ancestors, whom the Roman state should at length cashier and cast off, are meant all the Pagan deities and Heathen Gods which were worshipped in that empire.

5. By the desire of women, which the Roman also at that time should not regard as he was wont, is meant desire of wiving, or desire of having women for the society of life, conjugal affection, which is expressed (Gen. ii. 24) to be such a desire for which *a man shall leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall be both one flesh.* And it might have been translated in this place desire of *wives*, as well as desire of *women*, for there is no other word used in the original for *wives* above once or twice in the whole Scripture but this, which is here turned *women*. With the like use of the word *desire*, the spouse in the Canticles, chap. vii. 10, expresseth her well-beloved to be her husband: *I am my well-beloved's*, saith she, *and his desire is*

towards me: that is, he is my husband; for so twice before she expressed herself, (chap. ii. 16,) *My beloved is mine, and I am his;* and chap. vi. 3, *I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine.* So (Ezekiel xxiv. 16) the Lord, threatening to take away Ezekiel's wife, saith, "Behold I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes," and afterward (verse 18) it followeth, *and at even my wife died.* Yea, the Roman language itself is not unacquainted with this speech: *Cicero ad uxorem,* "*En mea lux, meum desiderium.*" This desire of women and married life the Roman should discountenance, when he shook off the Gods of his ancestors.

6. By the *strange and foreign God,* whom the Roman should at length acknowledge, is meant Christ. For though to the Jew every strange and foreign God were a false God, yet to the Gentiles who worshipped none but the idols, the foreign God was the true. Therefore the philosophers at Athens, when St. Paul preached Christ to them, said he preached *a foreign God.** The neglect of which observation hath much obscured this prophecy; this foreign God being still supposed to be a false God, when to those who worshipped all kinds of false Gods, as the Roman did, *a foreign God, whom their fathers knew not,* must needs be the true. (q)

7. Where it is said, "With this foreign God he shall honour Mahuzzims," these Mahuzzims or Maüzzims are these Demons we seek for, whom the Roman should worship with Christ, the

* Ξένον δαιμόνιον.

foreign God, whom he would embrace. For Mahuzzim are *Protectores Dii*, (such as saints and angels are supposed to be,) as I shall shew by and by, where, though I may be new for the particular, yet for the general I shall agree well enough with the fathers. For they constantly thought that under these Mahuzzim was some idol meant, which Antichrist would worship; and many of our time have taken it for the Mass. But I must first say something of the translation of this 38th verse, and then will come to the signification of this word *Mahuzzim*.

For the first: whereas the preposition in *leeloh* is usually neglected, and the words *eloha* and *mahuzzim* construed together as one thing, viz., *God Mahuzzim*, or (as some) *the God of forces;* I express the preposition, and construe *God* and *Mahuzzim* apart as two: viz., "To, or together with God he shall honour Mahuzzims," &c. (r) For the preposition *lamed* is made of *el*, and signifies the same with it, namely, an addition or adjoining of things, *ad*, *juxta*, *apud*, and signifies, *to*, *besides*, and *together with*, as (Lev. xviii. 18) "Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister," *el achocha*, that is, together with her sister.

By this means, the controversy betwixt Junius and Graserus is taken away. For Junius, as it should seem, seeing no reason why the preposition *le* should be neglected, and that, by so doing, the verb *cabad* was made irregularly and against use to govern a dative case, he expresses the preposition by *quod ad*, or *quod attinet ad*, that is,

as concerning. But the words *God* and *Mahuzzim* he sundereth not, but turneth them as *in statu constructo*, viz., *the God of mights* or forces, understanding thereby the true and almighty God himself.—Against which Graserus excepts, 1st, That to render the preposition *le* by *ad* (as concerning) savours of a Latinism rather than of an Hebraism. 2d, That he doth as good as strike out the distinctive accent *athnach* (^) which is a colon, inasmuch as he makes the sentence, being a full number, to be imperfect and defective, and yet would seem to stand in awe of that smaller distinction *zakephkaton* (:) over the word Mahuzzim, which yet stands there, as elsewhere, but for a *nota bene*. 3d, That to expound *God Mahuzzim* to be the true God, against the consent, not only of Jews, who ever take it for some idol or other, but of the ancient Christian writers, who understand by it some idol of Antichrist, yea, some the Devil himself; and of many of our own, who take it for the idol of the Mass, and some otherwise, yet for an idol-deity; to expound this of the true and almighty God, without example in Scripture, Graserus thinks not tolerable. Wherefore himself had rather yield the construction of the verb *cabad* to be irregular, (Junius himself having admitted it in the next member of the verse,) and to suppose it to be a mystical solecism, the Spirit intending, by the anomaly and incongruity of the syntax, to signify an anomaly and incongruity of religion. But these inconveniences on both sides, as far as I can see, are wholly avoided by that

translation we have given, whereof let the reader judge.

I come now to unfold the signification of the word *Mahuzzim*, a word which most translations retain, the Septuagint calling it Μαωζειμ, St. Jerome, or the Vulgar Latin, *Maozim*, the Geneva and others, *Maüzim*. This *Mahuzzim*, I say, is in the plural number; the singular is *Mahoz*, which in the abstract signifies sometimes strength, sometimes a fortress or bulwark; but the Hebrews use abstracts for concretes. Examples are many in the Old Testament, as *justitia pro justis*, captivity for captives, &c. In the New Testament, principalities, powers, and dominions, for princes, potentates, and dominators. So *Mahoz*, strength or a fortress, for him that strengthens or fortifies, that is, a protector, defender, guardian, helper. Wherefore the Septuagint five times in the Psalms renders the word *Mahoz*, ὑπερασπιστης, and the Vulgar Latin as often protector: the places are these,—Psalm xxvii. 1, "The Lord is *Mahoz chayai*, the protector of my life: of whom should I be afraid?" (Psalm xxviii. 8, "The Lord is their strength, and he is *Mahoz jeshuoth*, the Mahoz of salvations of his anointed:" where the Septuagint hath ὑπερασπιστὴς τῶν σωτηριῶν, the Vulgate, *protector salvationum*. Psalm xxxi. 3, "Bow down thine ear to me, deliver me speedily, be thou unto me *letsur Mahoz*, for a rock Mahoz;" Septuagint, εἰς Θεὸν ὑπερασπιστὴν,—Vulgate, *in Deum protectorem*. Again, verse 5, "Pull me out of the net that they have laid privily for me, (*ki*

atta Mahuzzi,) for thou art my protector;" the Septuagint, *ὑπερασπιστής μου*,—the Vulgate, *protector*. Psalm xxxvii. 39, "The salvation of the righteous is from the Lord, he is *Mahuzam*, their Mahoz in the time of trouble, and the Lord shall help them and deliver them from the wicked," &c., where the Septuagint and the Vulgate render as before *ὑπερασπιστὴς* and *protector*.

How think you now? Are not saints and angels worshipped as Mahuzzims? True Christians have with David, in the Psalms before quoted, one Mahoz, Jehovah Mahoz, that is, Christ; but apostate Christians have their many Mahuzzims. O, would they worshipped only *Mahoz yeshuoth*, that Mahoz of salvations, as you heard David even now call him, Psalm xxviii. You may, if you please, compare with these places of the Psalms that in the first verse of this eleventh of Daniel, where the angel saith he stood in the first year of Darius the Mede, to confirm and be a Mahoz to him, *ulemahoz lo*, which we translate, "to strengthen him;" by which we may see how fitly this name may be applied to angels, and so to saints, supposed, in helping, protecting, and assisting, to be like them.

Thus you see the concrete sense of *Mahoz*, for an helper, protector, and defender is not new. But what if we take the word passively, force and strength, for forts and strong ones? Will not, then, the valiant Martyrs and champions of the faith well bear the name of Mahuzzims? And these are they whom, at the first, Christians

worshipped only in this sort, as an honour peculiarly due unto their sufferings.

Moreover, that you may not think this word and the notion thereof improper to be given unto a deity, observe that the true God is called *tsur*, a rock, seven times, Deut. xxxii., which the Vulgate translates as often, *Deus;* yea in the same place false Gods are called also *tsur*, or rocks: verse 31, "Their Rock," that is, the Gentiles' Rock, "is not as our Rock, our enemies themselves being judges." And verse 37, "Where are their Gods," that is, *Baalim*, "their Rock in whom they trusted, which did eat the fat of their sacrifices?" &c. The like you shall find in Hannah's song, and other places of Scripture. See now the parity: the true God is called a rock; Baalim and false Gods are also called rocks: the true God, or Christ himself, is often by David called Mahoz; why may not then false Gods, or plurality of Christs, be called Mahuzzim? Rock and fortress are not words of so great difference.

Thus having cleared the chief difficulties in the text, and made the way smooth, let us read over the words again, and apply the interpretation unto them.

CHAPTER XVII.

A particular explication (by way of paraphrase) of the forementioned prophecy in Dan. xi. *This further illustrated by several observations, wherein the events are represented as exactly suitable and applicable to Daniel's prophecy. That at the beginning of saint-worship in the Church, saints and their relics were called bulwarks, fortresses, walls, towers, guardians, protectors, &c., according to the native signification of the word used by Daniel, Mahuzzim. A brief explication of the following verses in Daniel* xi., *viz.* 40, 41, 42, 43.

Dan. xi. 36.	Verse 36.
THEN a King shall do according to his will, and shall exalt or magnify himself above every God.	THAT is, towards the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Roman shall prevail, and set up the fourth kingdom, making himself master of the kingdom of Macedon, and advancing himself from this time forward by continual conquests, shall lord it over every king and nation.
Yea, against the God of gods shall he speak marvellous things; and shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished: for the determined time shall be fulfilled.	Yea, Christ, the God of gods, and the King of the kings of the earth, (who in those times should appear in the world,) the Roman shall mock, blaspheme, and crucify, and by bloody edicts shall persecute and massacre his servants the Christians; and yet shall prosper in his empire, until these outrageous times be ended, that is, until the days of Constantine: for the time God hath appointed must be fulfilled.
Verse 37. Then he shall not regard the Gods of his	Verse 37. When that appointed time for the date of his prosperity comes to its period, and the time of

ancestors, nor shall he regard the desire of women, no, nor any God; but he shall magnify himself above all.

the ruin and change of his dominion draws near, then this Roman state shall cashier and forsake the idols and false Gods whom their fathers worshipped, and shall acknowledge Christ, a God whom their fathers knew not. At that time "the desire of women" and married life shall be discountenanced and shall not be of that account and regard it had been; but, contrary to the long-continued custom of the Romans, single life shall be honoured and privileged above it: yea, and soon after the Roman shall bear himself so as if he regarded not any God, and with Antichristian pride shall magnify himself over all.

38. For to (or together with) God in his seat, he shall honour Mahuzzims; even together with that God whom his ancestors knew not, shall he honour [them] with gold, and with silver, and with precious stones, and with pleasant things.

38 That is, together with the Christian God, who is a jealous God, and to be worshipped alone, he shall worship Mahuzzims, even in his seat and temple, even with the foreign God, whom his ancestors acknowledged not, shall he honour Mahuzzims with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and with pleasant things.

39. And he shall make the holds of the Mahuzzims withal (or jointly) to the foreign God; whom acknowledging, he shall increase with honour: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall dis-

39 And though the Christian God, whom he shall profess to acknowledge and worship, can endure no compeers; yet shall he consecrate his temples and monasteries (ecclesiastical holds) jointly to the Christian God, and to his Mahuzzims (*Deo et Sanctis*): yea, he shall distribute the earth among his Mahuzzims; so that, beside several patrimonies which in every country he shall allot them, he shall share

tribute the earth for a reward.	whole kingdoms and provinces among them: Saint George shall have England; Saint Andrew, Scotland; Saint Denis, France; Saint James, Spain; Saint Mark, Venice, &c.; and bear rule as presidents and patrons of their several countries.

Thus we see how ῥητῶς, how expressly, the Spirit foretold that the Roman empire, having rejected the multitude of Gods and demons worshipped by their ancestors, and betaken themselves to that one and only God which their fathers knew not, should nevertheless depart from this their faith, and revive again the old theology of demons, by a new superinduction of Mahuzzims.

Now, although this prophecy thus applied be so evident, that merely pointing at the event were able almost to convince the reader, yet, that we may yet the more admire the truth of God in the contemplation of an event so suitable, I will add these following observations concerning it:—

1. That, agreeably with the date of the Holy Ghost, the Roman historians themselves have observed and marked out that time of their prevailing against Macedonia (which I said was accomplished toward the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes) for the beginning of their dominion over the world. Lucius Florus, lib. ii., cap. 7, says,—"Hannibal being worsted, Africa became the reward of the victory, and after Africa the whole world also. None thought it a shame to be overcome, after Carthage was. Macedonia, Greece, Syria, and all other nations,

as if carried with a certain current and torrent of fortune, did soon follow Africa: but the first who followed were the Macedonians, a people that sometime affected the empire of the world."* In Velleius Paterculus, lib. i., c. 6, is an annotation out of one Æmilius Sura, in these words,—"The Assyrians had the sovereign dominion the first of all nations, then the Medes and Persians, after them the Macedonians, afterwards (those two kings, Philip and Antiochus, being overcome, and that a little after that Carthage was subdued) the imperial power came to the Romans. Between which time and the beginning of the reign of Ninus, the first Assyrian king, there are one thousand nine hundred ninety-five years."† Here the time of the Romans prevailing against the Macedonian Kings is made the beginning of their empire, even as Daniel also beginneth the Roman account from thence; but with this difference, that,

* Cedente Hannibale, præmium victoriæ Africa fuit, et secutus Africam terrarum orbis. Post Carthaginem vinci neminem puduit; secutæ sunt statim Africam gentes, Macedonia, Græcia, Syria, cæteraque omnia, quodam quasi æstu et torrente fortunæ: sed primi omnium Macedones, affectator quondam imperii populus.

† Æmilius Sura de annis populi Romani. Assyrii principes omnium gentium, rerum potiti sunt, deinde Medi, postea Persæ, deinde Macedones; exinde duobus regibus, Philippo et Antiocho, qui à Macedonibus, oriundi erant, haud multo post Carthaginem subactam, devictis, summa imperii ad populum Romanum pervenit. Inter hoc tempus et initium Nini regis Assyriorum, qui princeps rerum potitus, intersunt anni MDCCCCXCV.

whereas Æmilius Sura seems to reckon from the beginning of those prevailings in the victories against Philip, Daniel counts from the victory against Perseus his son, when that conquest was now perfected, and Macedonia brought into a province; which happened, as I have already said, the same year that Antiochus Epiphanes profaned the temple of Jerusalem.

2. That no kingdom in the world, that we know of, could more literally be said in their conquests to exalt and magnify themselves above every God, than the Roman, in respect of a solemn custom they used in their wars, by a certain charm to call out the Gods from any city when they besieged it. The form whereof Macrobius gives us, l. iii. Saturn., c. 8, as he found it in Sammonicus Serenus's fifth book of hidden secrets, namely this,—"If it be a God, if it be a Goddess, that hath the people and city of Carthage in protection; and thou especially, whosoever thou art, the patron of this city and people, I pray and beseech, and, with your leave, require thee, to abandon the people and city of Carthage, to forsake the places, temples, ceremonies, and enclosures of their city, to go away from them, and to strike fear, terror, and astonishment into that people and city, and, having left it, to come to Rome to me and mine; and that our cities, places, temples, and ceremonies, be more acceptable and better liked of you: that you would take the charge of me, of the people of Rome, and of my soldiers, so as

we may know and understand it. If you d
I vow to build you temples, and to app
solemn sports for you." (s)

3. That Constantine, the first emperor u
whom the state forsook the Gods of their forefath
and became Christian, together with this alterat
abrogated those ancient Roman laws, *Lex Julia*
Lex Papia, wherein the *desire of women* and mar
life was so much privileged and encouraged,
single and unmarried life disadvantaged. H
it in the words of Sozomen, lib. i., c. 9, H
Eccl.,—"There was (saith he) an ancient
among the Romans, forbidding those who, a
five and twenty years, were unmarried, to en
the like privileges with married ones; and besi
many other things, that they should have
benefit by testaments and legacies, unless th
were next of kindred: and those who had
children, to have half their goods confiscat
Wherefore the Emperor, seeing those who, f
God's sake, were addicted to chastity and vi
ginity, to be for this cause in a worse conditio
he accounted it a folly for men to go about
increase their kind with such carefulness ar
diligence, whereas Nature, according to Divi
moderation, continually receives as well dimin
tion as increase. Therefore he published a la
to the people, That both those who lived a sing
life, and those who had no children, should enjo
the like privileges with others: yea, he enacte
that those who lived in chastity and virginit
should be privileged above them; enabling bot

sexes, though under years, to make testaments, contrary to the accustomed polity of the Romans." This alteration of the Roman law by Constantine, Eusebius also witnesseth, lib. iv., cap. 26, *De Vitâ Constantini*, and again, cap. 28, where he saith,—"That above all he honoured most those that had consecrated their lives to Divine philosophy, (he means a monastical life,) and therefore he almost adored the most holy company of perpetual virgins." That which the fathers had thus enacted, the sons also seconded, and some of the following emperors, by new edicts, till there was no relic left of those privileges wherewith married men had been respected; which, Procopius saith, how rightly I examine not, was the cause of the ruin of that empire, which was so much enfeebled and weakened by the diminished number of children, that it was not able to match the numerous armies of the barbarous nations.—This was the first step of the disregard of marriage and the desire of wiving; which was not an absolute prohibition, but a discouragement. But no sooner had the Roman Bishop and his clergy got the power into their hands, but it grew to an absolute prohibition, not for monks only, but for the whole clergy; which was the highest disrespect that could be to that which God had made honourable among all men.

4. and Lastly, It is a thing not to be passed by without admiration, that the fathers and others, even at the beginning of Saint-worship, by I know not what fatal instinct, used to call the

Saints and their relics, towers, walls, bulwarks, fortresses,—that is *Mahuzzim*, in the prime and native signification.

Basil, in his oration upon the forty Martyrs, whose relics were dispersed over all the countries thereabouts, speaks in this manner:—"These are those who, having taken possession of our country, as certain conjoined towers,* secure it from the incursions of enemies." The same Basil concludes his oration upon Mamas the Martyr in this manner:—"That God who hath gathered us together in this place, and disposes of what is to come, keep us safe from hurt, and secure us from the ravenous wolf, and preserve stedfast this church of Cæsarea, being guarded with the mighty towers of Martyrs." †

Chrysostom, in his 32d Homily upon the Epistle to the Romans, speaking of the relics of Peter and Paul,—"This corpse," saith he, meaning of Paul, "fortifies this city of Rome more strongly than any tower, or than ten thousand rampires, as also doth the corpse of Peter." ‡ Are not these strong Mahuzzims?

The like whereunto is that of Venantius Fortunatus, a Christian Poet, not much above an age younger than Chrysostom:—

> A facie hostili duo propugnacula præsunt,
> Quos Fidei turres urbs caput orbis habet.
> The Faith's two TOWERS in lady Rome do lie,
> Two BULWARKS strong against the enemy.

* Πύργοι τινὲς συνεχεῖς.

† Φρουρουμένην τοῖς μεγάλοις πύργοις τῶν Μαρτύρων.

‡ Παντὸς πύργου καὶ μυριών ἐστὶ περιβόλων ἀσφαλέστερον.

At the same thing aims Gregory, lib. vii., ep. 23, *Ad Rusticianam Patriciam*, entreating her to come to Rome,—"If you fear the swords (saith he) and wars of Italy, you ought attentively to consider how great the protection of blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, is in this city; wherein, without any great number of people, without the aid of soldiers, we have been so many years, in the midst of swords, by God's providence safely preserved from all hurt."*

But to return again to St. Chrysostom, who, in his homily upon the Egyptian Martyrs, *Hom.* 70, *Ad Populum Antiochenum*, speaks after this manner,—"Those Saints' bodies," saith he, "fortify† our city more strongly than an impregnable wall of adamant; and, as certain high rocks, hanging on every side, they repel not only the assaults of those enemies which are sensible and seen by the eye, but also overthrow and defeat the ambuscades of invisible fiends, and all the stratagems of the Devil." Here you see are Mahuzzims too.

So, long before, in the days of Constantine, James Bishop of Nisibis, renowned for holiness, was, according to order given by Constantine in his lifetime, saith Gennadius, buried within the walls of that city, being a frontier of the empire, *ob custodiam: viz., civitatis, for the safeguard of the state. Gennad. de Vir. Illustr., cap.* 6.

Evagrius, lib. i., cap. 13, tells us that the

* Si gladios Italiæ et bella formidetis, &c.

† Τειχιζει.

Antiochians offered up a supplication to the Emperor Leo the first, about the year 460, for the keeping of the corpse of holy Simeon, surnamed *Stylita*, or the Pillarist, in this form,—"Because our city hath no wall, [for it had been demolished in a fury,] therefore we brought hither this most holy body, that it might be to us a wall and a fortress;"* which would be in Hebrew *leshur ulemahoz.*

St. Hilary also will tell us, That neither the guards of Saints nor the bulwarks of Angels† are wanting to those who are willing to stand. Here Angels are Mahuzzim, as Saints were in the former.

The Greeks at this day, in their *Preces Horariæ*, thus invocate the blessed Virgin,—"O thou Virgin Mother of God, thou impregnable Wall, thou Fortress of Salvation,‡ we call upon thee that thou would frustrate the purposes of our enemies, and be a fence to this city." Thus they go on, calling her the hope, safeguard, and sanctuary of Christians. Here is *Mahoz Mahuzzim*, a strong Mahoz indeed.

To conclude:—the titles of protectors, guardians, and defenders, which is the signification of *Mahuzzim*, when a person is meant, as they are more frequent, so are they no less ancient. Greg. Nyssen., in his third oration on the forty Martyrs, calls them *guarders and protectors.*§ Eucherius calls his St. Gervase the

* Τείχος καὶ οχύρωμα. † Angelorum munitiones.
‡ *Mahoz yeshuhoth*, Psal. xxviii.
§ Δορυφοροι καὶ ὑπερασπισταὶ.

perpetual *protector** of the faithful. Theodoret, (*lib.* 8, *de Curandis Græcorum Affectionibus,*) calls the holy Martyrs *guardians* of cities, lieutenants of places, *captains of men, princes, champions, and guardians,* by whom disasters are turned from us, and those which come from devils debarred and driven away.

I might here add something also concerning Images, whose worship is another part of the "doctrine of demons," and shew how well the name Mahuzzim would befit them, which the Iconomachical Council of Constantinople calls so unluckily the fortresses or Mahuzzim of the Devil.† And perhaps the nine and thirtieth verse in the fore-alleged prophecy might be yet more literally translated, if the word *g'asah,* [*facere,*] were taken in a religious sense,— "And he shall [do unto, or] offer unto the holds of Mahuzzim, together with the foreign God," &c., that is, he shall do religious service to the Images and Saints together with Christ. I might also put you in mind of the term, *munimentum,* given to the cross, and that so usual Latin phrase of *munire signo crucis,* to fortify (that is to sign) with the sign of the Cross; but I will not engage myself too far in these grammatical speculations. As for the following verses of this prophecy, if any desire to know it, they may, I think, be interpreted and applied thus:—

Verse 40. And at the time of the end [that is, in the Latter Times of the Roman power] shall the

* Propugnator.

† Δαιμόνικὰ ὀχυρώματα.

King of the South, that is, the Saracen, push at him; and the King of the North, the Turk, shall come against him, to wit, the Saracen, like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen, and many ships, and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

"41. He shall enter also into the glorious land," Palestine, "and many shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand, Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon:" that is, the inhabitants of Arabia Petræa, which were never yet provincials of the Turkish empire; yea with some of them he is fain to be at a pension for the safer passage of his caravans.

"Verse 42. He," the Turk, "shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries" of those parts, "and the land of Egypt," though it should hold out long under the Mamelukes, even till the year 1517, "shall not escape;"

"43. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and the Cushites," that is, the neighbouring nations, whether of Africa or Libya, as those of Algiers, &c., or of the Arabians, in Scripture called Cushim, "shall be at his steps," that is, at his devotion.

That which remains, as I suppose, is not yet fulfilled, and therefore I leave it; time will make it manifest.

PART II.

Ver. 2. Ἐν ὑποκρίσει Ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδιάν συνειδησιν.

Through the hypocrisy (or feigning) of liars, of those who have their conscience seared.

Ver. 3. Κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάλημψιν μετὰ ἐυχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

Of those who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.

CHAPTER I.

The author's three reasons for translating the text differently from the common versions. That the preposition (Ἐν) *in the text signifies* through *or* by. *Other places of Scripture where it signifies likewise* causam *or* modum actionis.

I HAVE spoken hitherto, of the first part of this prophecy, being a description of the character of that solemn defection which was to come. I come now to the second part of my division—the quality of the persons, and the means whereby it was to enter and be advanced, which is set forth in the verses now read; which though you may find by others otherwise translated, yet I hope the translation which I have propounded, if the judicious reader please to

examine it, will approve itself not only not to be a forced one, but such as salves that incongruity of construction which the other could not avoid. For it is usually translated intransitively, or with reference to the persons expressed in the former verse—viz. "that they should speak lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with an hot iron, and forbidding marriage, and commanding to abstain from meats." So that what in the former verse is named *doctrines of devils*, should only mean that in general terms, which in these verses is particularly instanced to be "doctrines of prohibiting marriage, and abstaining from meats," as two branches of that devilish doctrine; for so Calvin, Melancthon, and some others seem to expound it.

But why this interpretation should not be the most likely, my first reason is—

1. Because it makes St. Paul, who speaks of that great Apostasy of Christians which was to be in the latter times, to instance only in the smaller and, if I may so say, almost circumstantial errors; and to omit the main and principal, which the Scripture elsewhere tells us should be idolatry or *spiritual fornication*. Who can believe that he would so pass by the substance, and name only that which in comparison is but an appendix thereto?

2. He prophesies here in express words of such things as were to come in * *the latter times*. But errors about marriage and meats were no novelty in the apostles' own times, as the dili-

* ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς.

gent reader may easily collect out of their epistles; which makes it improbable he would specify the Apostasy of the latter times in these alone.

3. But my last reason, whereunto I think I may trust, is that the syntax of the words in the Greek is incapable of such an intransitive construction, and consequently of the sense depending thereon. For the persons intimated in the former verse, are expressed in the nominative case,* but the persons intended here we find in the genitive;† and I cannot see how they can agree with the former, after the manner of intransitive construction, without a breach of grammatical congruity, not elsewhere sampled in our apostle's writings. Indeed they would agree with *demons*,‡ but that would be a harsh sense every way; for either we must say (as some do) that by devils are meant devilish men, or men led by the devil, which is an hard signification; or else it would be a stranger sense, and I think not over-pliable to the usual exposition, to say, that devils should lie, have seared consciences, and forbid marriage or meats. So that Beza, with others, had rather confess a breach of syntax than incur the inconvenience of such a forced sense. "The Apostle," saith he, "heeded more the matter than he did the grammar." (Major est habita sententiæ quam constructionis ratio.)

* τινὲς προσέχοντες.

† ψευδολόγων, κεκαυτηριασμένων, κωλυόντων.

‡ Δαιμονίων.

But what needs this, so long as there is a better way to salve it?—namely, to construe the words *transitively*, making all these genitive cases to be governed of * *hypocrisy;* as *through the hypocrisy of liars;* † *through the hypocrisy of those who had their consciences seared;* and so forward. Which construction is observed and followed by Andreas Hyperius, one of our reformed writers, who translates, "Per simulationem falsiloquorum," &c., and expounds it, "de modo quo fallent Spiritus Impostores; fallunt per simulationem seu hypocrisin falsiloquorum," &c. And I believe that many others have taken it so; for our late Latin translations are indifferent to be taken either way. Howsoever it be, I see no way but this to keep the syntax true and even, and wholly to avoid the forementioned inconveniences; which, as it is easy and obvious, and not strained, so I hope to let you see the event to have been most answerable thereunto; that this was the manner, and this the means, this the quality of the persons whereby the doctrine of demons was first brought in, advanced and maintained in the Church—viz. through the hypocrisy, feigning, craft, or counterfeiting of those who told lies, of those who had their consciences seared, &c.

As for the use of the preposition *in*,‡ to signify the cause, the instrument, the manner of action,§ he that is not a stranger in the Scrip-

* Ἐν ὑποκρίσει· as ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων.

† ἐν ὑποκρίσει κεκαυτηριασμένων. ‡ (Ἐν.)

§ Causam, instrumentum, or modum actionis.

ture knows it to be most frequent, the Greek text borrowing it from the use of the Hebrew preposition. But two or three examples will not do amiss. (Matthew v. 13.) "If the salt hath lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" (*ἐν τίνι ἁλισθήσεται.*) Acts xvii. 31, "Because God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by the man whom he hath ordained." (*ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισε.*) 2 Pet. iii. 1, "I stir up your pure minds, by way of remembrance." (*ἐν ὑπομνήσει.*) Tit. i. 9, "That he may be able by sound doctrine (*ἐν διδασκαλιᾷ ὑγιαινούσῃ,*) to exhort and convince the gainsayers." And most naturally to the business we have in hand, 2 Thess. ii. 9, 10, of the man of sin, "Whose coming (saith the apostle,) is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, (or through them,) and through all deceivableness of unrighteousness," &c., *ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἀδικιάς.* So in my text, (*ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων*), "through the hypocrisy of liars," &c.

CHAPTER II.

The words of the text explained. That for the character or quality of the persons that made way for, or brought in the great apostasy, some were liars, some had seared consciences, some forbade marriage and meats; others were guilty of all these imputations. What is meant by the hypocrisy of liars: that this appeared in three things:—1. Lies of miracles. 2. Fabulous Legends. 3. Counterfeit writings *under the name of antiquity.—That lies of miracles appeared in*—1. Their forgery. 2. Illusion. 3. Misapplication.—*What is meant by having seared consciences. That the strange and indecent tales wherewith the legends and the like writings are stuffed, argue those that did either vent or believe them to be men of seared (that is, hard and unfeeling consciences). Some instances of the indecency of those stories.*

Now for the unfolding of the words, this must first be observed in general, that they are not to be so understood, as if those who are the bringers in and advancers of the doctrine of demons should every one of them be guilty of all the several imputations in this description: but they are to be construed rather as an asyndeton, by understanding the conjunction, as if it had been uttered thus—"through the hypocrisy of liars, and through the hypocrisy of men of seared consciences—and, lastly, by the hypocrisy of those who forbid marriage and meats:"—or thus "through the hypocrisy partly of liars, partly of men of seared consciences, partly of those who forbid marriage, and command to abstain from

meats:" that so though many were guilty of all, yet some may be exempt from some; as namely, some might be guilty of the last note, of "forbidding marriage" and "commanding from meats," and yet free of the former, of being "counterfeit liars and men of seared consciences:" which I speak for reverence of some of the ancients, who, though otherwise holy men, yet cannot be acquitted from all the imputations here mentioned, nor altogether excused from having an hand accidentally through the fate of the times wherein they lived, in laying the groundwork whereon soon after the great Apostasy was builded.

This, therefore, being remembered, I come now to the unfolding of them in particular: and first of the first, "the hypocrisy of liars." * The word *hypocrisy* signifies dissimulation, a feigning, counterfeiting, a semblance and shew of that which is not so indeed as it seemeth. And this word we must repeat, as belonging in common to the rest which follows. For all would be counterfeit; *lying* would carry the counterfeit of truth, the *seared conscience* a semblance of devotion, the *restraint of marriage* should be a shew of chastity, and *abstaining from meats* a false appearance of abstinence. For the persons of whom they are spoken, should either make a shew of what themselves knew was not; or that which they thought they had, should be no better than a false shew and counterfeit of what they took it for. The vulgar Latin, in

* ὑποκρίσις ψευδολόγων.

Mark xii. 15, and the Syriac in the same place, turn the word *hypocrisy*,* *craft* and *subtilty*; which sense, if need were, would not be denied admittance here.

But I return to *the hypocrisy of liars*; which I conceive to be the same and no other than that which our apostle speaks in the same case, 2 Thess. ii. where he tells us, that the coming of the man of sin and the Apostasy attending him, should be "*after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness*," or unrighteous and ungodly deceiving, and that "*God should send them strong delusions that they might believe a lie*," &c. Yea, some of this, and of that which follows in that place, may extend also to the rest which follows in my text; howsoever, the most thereof, as you hear, doth most evidently expound this *hypocrisy of liars*.

Now according to the event, this hypocrisy of liars doth appear in three things:—

1. *Lies of miracles.* 2. *Fabulous legends* of the acts of saints and sufferings of martyrs. 3. *Counterfeit writings* under the name of the best and first antiquity.

Lies of miracles will display their hypocrisy in three particulars:—1. *Forgery.* 2. *Illusion.* 3. *Misapplication.*

1. *Forgery of miracles never done;* as were the reports of wondrous dreams and visions, which had no other credit but the author's honesty: or miraculous cures, by the power and

* Versutia—dolus.

reliques of saints deceased; as when those who never were blind, made others believe they had newly received sight.

2. *Illusion;* when though something were done, yet it was but a seeming and a counterfeit only of a miraculous work indeed; some juggling trick of the devil or his instruments.

3. Lastly, *misapplication;* either when that was attributed to a divine power, which was nothing but * *the work and operation of the devil;* or when it was interpreted or abused to invite and confirm men in some idolatrous error, as it happened in the miracles at the shrines and sepulchres of the holy martyrs, which were interpreted to be for confirmation of the opinion of their power, presence, and notice of human affairs after death, and to warrant and encourage men to have recourse unto them by prayer and invocation, as unto mediators, and to give that honour unto their reliques which was due unto God alone. The like is to be said of the miracles of images and of the host; which, though they smelt strong of forgery or illusion, were supposed by a divine disposition to be wrought for the like end and purpose. All which was † the power of seduction, or *strong delusion,* to make the world believe a lie, as St. Paul speaks, 2 Thess. ii. 11.

Concerning *the hypocrisy of fabulous legend-writers* of the acts of saints and martyrs, you know what it means: as also the last which was named, *counterfeit authors under the name of*

* ἐνέργεια τοῦ Σατανᾶ. † ἐνέργεια πλάνης.

antiquity, as approving those errors which latter times devised, I shall not need here to use any further explication. And thus you see what is comprehended under the hypocrisy, counterfeiting or feigning of liars.

I should now come to display the truth of this particular of this prophesy in the event; but I will first unfold the next imputation, *the hypocrisy of those who have their conscience seared:* which, though it might be exemplified in other things, yet I mean to instance only in that aforementioned, and so must give you the story of both together.

Through the hypocrisy of those who have seared consciences. The Greek word *cautery*, Καυτηριον, signifies both the place seared, and the mark printed by the searing of an hot iron. The Greek word *to cauterize*, καυτηριαζειν, is to sear with an hot iron, or to cut off with searing, as surgeons do rotten members: now that which is seared becomes more hard and brawny, and so more dull, and not so sensible in feeling as otherwise. In this sense, *those cauterized in their conscience* signifies those who have a hard and brawny conscience, which hath no feeling in it. In the other sense, as *to cauterize* is to cut off by searing, it must signify those who have no conscience left. There is not much difference; but I follow the first, a hard and unfeeling conscience. And whether those *liars* whereof we spake before (to use no other instances) were not of such metal for their conscience, I think no man can deny.

Who could have coined, or who could have believed such monstrous stuff as the legends are stored with, but such as were cauterized? If they had had any feeling or tenderness, not only of conscience, but even of sense, they could never have believed or vented such stuff as there is.

[As that the Virgin Mary should draw out her breasts, and milk in I know not what clerix's mouth. (Vincent. Hist. lib. vii. c. 4.) That she played the midwife to a certain unchaste abbess, and sent the bastard by two angels to a certain hermit to be brought up. (Idem ibid. c. 86. Eam venisse, et concubuisse prima nocte inter quendam sponsum et ejus-sponsam. Idem, lib. vii. c. 87.)

Cæsarius, in his seventh book, chap. 34, reports, that the Virgin Mary, for twelve whole years together, did supply the place of a certain nun called Beatrice, while the nun lay in the stews, till at length returning, she freed the Virgin from standing sentinel any longer. And lib. vii. cap. 33.—That she said to a certain soldier, I will be thy wife, come and kiss me; and made him do so. That she took a monk about the neck and kissed him.

In an Italian book, called "The Miracles of the Blessed Virgin," printed at Milan, 1547. "A certain abbess being great with child, the Holy Virgin, willing to cover her crime, did in her stead present herself before the Bishop in form of an abbess, and shewed by ocular demonstration that she was not with child."

But that which Joannes de Nicol, in his "Reformed Spaniard," tells, that he read taken out of Trithemius, is the more worthy to be remembered, as being a principal motive in his conversion, who was till then extremely addicted to the idol worship of the Blessed Virgin; which was much cooled, when he read, "That she came into the chamber of Friar Allen (a Dominican that made her rosary,) made a ring of her own hair, wherewith she espoused herself unto him, kissed him, ei ubera sua contrectare permisisse, et cum eo familiariter sicut sponsam cum sponso coiisse."]

Whether think you not that these fellows were *seared in their conscience?* What block could have been more senseless? Melchior Canus, speaking of the Golden Legend, as they call it, a book fraught with such stuff as you have heard, methinks almost expresses the meaning of a cauterized conscience: "A fellow (saith he) of an iron mouth and leaden heart wrote this;" "Hanc homo scripsit ferrei oris et plumbei cordis," as if he had said, κεκαυτηριασμένος τὴν ἰδιάν συνείδησιν, of a brawny and unfeeling conscience.

CHAPTER III.

That the worship of saints and their relics was brought in and promoted by the hypocrisy of liars, or by lying miracles.—No mention of miracles done by the bodies or relics of martyrs in the first 300 *years after Christ: nor was the mediation of martyrs believed in the first ages of the Church.—That the Gentiles' idolatry of demons was advanced by lying miracles, proved out of* Eusebius, Tertullian, *and* Chrysostom.

But now I come to shew how this prediction of our apostle hath been accomplished; how the *cozenage and feigning of liars* was the means whereby the doctrine of demons was advanced in the Church; I mean the deifying and worshipping of saints and angels, the adoring and templing of relics, the bowing down to images, the worshipping of crosses as new idol-columns, the worshipping of the breaden God or any other visible thing whatsoever upon supposal of any Divinity therein: all which I have proved to be nothing else but the Gentiles' idolatrous theology of demons revived among Christians.

The first of these, *the deifying and invocating of saints and adoring relics*, is the most ancient for time of all the rest, and began to appear in the Church presently after the death of Julian the Apostate, who was the last heathen Emperor. The grounds and occasions whereof were most strange reports of *wonders* shewn upon those who approached the shrines of martyrs, and

prayed at their Memories * and Sepulchres; devils were charmed, diseases cured, the blind saw, the lame walked, yea the dead revived, and other the like: which the doctors of those times for the most part avouched to be done by the power and prayers of the glorified martyrs, and by the notice they took of men's devotions at their sepulchres; though at the beginning those devotions were directed to God alone, and such places were merely chosen for the stirring up of zeal and fervour by the memory of those blessed and glorious champions of Christ. But while the world stood in admiration, and most men esteemed these wonders as glorious beams of the triumph of Christ; they were soon persuaded to call upon them as *Patrons* and *Mediators*, whose power with God, and notice of things done upon earth, they thought that these signs and miracles approved.

Thus the relics of martyrs beginning to be esteemed above the richest jewels, for the supposed virtue even of the very air of them, were wonderfully sought after as some *divine elixir*, sovereign both to body and soul. Whereupon another scene of wonders entered, namely, of *visions and revelations*, wonderful and admirable, for the discovery of the sepulchres and ashes of martyrs which were quite forgotten, yea, of some whose names and memories till then no man had ever heard of; as S. Ambrose's Gervasius and Protasius. Thus in every corner of the Chris-

* Their monuments.

tian world were new martyrs' bones ever and anon discovered, whose verity again miraculous effects and cures seemed to approve; and, therefore, they were diversely dispersed, and gloriously templed and enshrined. (v)

All these things happened in that one age, and were come to this height in less than a hundred years. But here is the wonder most of all to be wondered at, that none of these miraculous signs were ever heard of in the Church for the first 300 years after Christ, until about the year 360; after that the Empire, under Constantine and his sons, having publicly embraced the Christian faith, the Church had peace, and the bodies of the despised martyrs, such as could be found, were now bestowed in most magnificent temples, and there gloriously enshrined. And yet the Christians long before had used to keep their assemblies at the cemeteries and monuments of their martyrs: how came it to pass that no such virtue of their bones and ashes, no such testimonies of their power after death, were discovered until now?

The bones of Babylas were the first, that all my search can find, which charmed the devil of Daphne, Apollo Daphnæus, when Julian the Apostate offered so many sacrifices to make him speak; and being asked why he was so mute,—forsooth the corpse of Babylas, the martyr, buried near the temple in Daphne, a delightful suburb of Antioch, stopped his windpipe. I fear, I fear there was some hypocrisy in this business,

and the devil had some feat to play: the very name of BABYLAS is enough to breed jealousy; it is an ominous name, the name Babylas: yea, and this happened too at Antioch, where Babylas was bishop and martyr in the persecution of Decius. Would it not do the devil good, there to begin his mystery, where the Christian name was first given to the followers of Christ? However this was then far otherwise construed, and a conceit quickly taken that other martyrs' bones might upon trial be found as terrible to the devil as those of Babylas; which was no sooner tried, but experience presently verified it with improvement, as you heard before: so that all the world rung with wonders done by martyrs, and even holy men, who at the first suspected, were at length surprised and carried away with the power of delusion.

Besides the silence of all undoubted antiquity about any such sepulchral wonders to have happened in the former ages, the very manner of speech which the fathers living in this miraculous age used, when they spake of these things, will argue that they were then accounted novelties, and not as continued from the Apostles' times. Chrysostom, in his oration against the Gentiles, of the business of Babylas, speaks thus;* "If any man believes not those things were done by the Apostles, let him now, *beholding the present*, desist from his impudency."

* Εἴ τις ἀπιστεῖ τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων γεγενημένοις, τὰ παρόντα θεωρῶν παυέσθω τῆς ἀναισχυντίας.

Ambrose, (Epist. ad sororem Marcellinam,) relating part of the speech he made upon the translation of the bodies of Gervasius and Protasius, and the miracles then shewn, * "you see," saith he, "the miracles of ancient times"—he means the times of Christ and his Apostles—"renewed." S. Augustine (Lib. de civ. Dei 22, cap. 8,) in a discourse of the miracles of that time, saith, "We made an order to have bills given out of such miracles as were done, when we saw the wonders of ancient times renewed in ours." †

But, alas! now began the *Latter Times*; this was the fatal time, and thus the Christian Apostasy was to be ushered. If they had known this, it would have turned their joyous shoutings and triumphs at these things into mourning. The end which these signs and wonders aimed at, and at length brought to pass, should have made them remember that warning which was given the ancient people of God, Deut. xiii. "If there arise among you a Prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder; and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, *Let us go after other Gods and serve them*; Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that Prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: For the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether

* Reparata vetusti temporis miracula cernitis.

† Id namque fieri voluimus, cum videremus, antiquis similia divinarum signa virtutum etiam nostris temporibus frequentari, et ea non debere multorum notitiæ deperire.

you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul."

But why should I go any further before I tell you, that even in this also the idolatry of saint-worship was a true counterfeit of the Gentiles' idolatry of demons? Did not demon-worship enter after the same manner? Was it not first insinuated, and at length established, by signs and wonders of the very self-same kind and fashion? Listen what Eusebius will tell us in his fifth Book de Preparat. Evangel. Chap. ii. according to the Greek edition of Rob. Stephen. "When," saith he, "those wicked spirits," as he proved them to be which were worshipped under the names of *Demons*, "saw mankind brought off to a deifying of the dead," he means by erecting statues, and ordaining ceremonies and sacrifices for their memorials "they insinuated themselves, and helped forward their error, by certain motions of the statues which anciently were consecrated to the honour of the deceased;" as also * by ostentation of oracles and cures of diseases, whereby they drove the superstitious headlong, sometimes to take them to be some heavenly powers and Gods indeed, and sometimes to be † "the souls of their deified worthies." "And so," saith he, "the earth-neighbouring

* ἐγύθεν ἔφεδροι καὶ συνεργοὶ τῆς πλάνης παρῆσαν, κινήσεσί τισι τῶν ξοάνων, ἃ δὴ ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν κατοιχομένων ἀνδρῶν πρὸς τῶν παλαιῶν ἀφιέρωται, καὶ, ταῖς διὰ χρησμῶν φαντασίαις, θεραπείαις τε σωμάτων.

† τὰς τῶν τεθεοποιημένων Ἡρώων ψυχάς.

demons, which are those princes of the air, those spiritualities of wickedness, and ringleaders to all evil, were on all hands accounted for great Gods; and the memory of the ancients deceased was thought worthy to be celebrated with a greater service,* the features of whose bodies the images dedicated in every city seemed to represent; but the souls of them, and those divine and incorporeal powers, *the wicked demons* counterfeited by working many miracles." †

Hear Tertullian also speak in his Apology to the Gentiles, cap. 21, at the end: ‡ "Search, therefore, whether this Deity of Christ be true or not. If it be such, by the knowledge whereof a man is reformed to good, it follows then that the false be renounced; especially that whole mystery," he means of the Gentiles' idolatry, and demon-worship, "being discovered, which under the names and images of the dead, through signs, miracles, and, oracles, obtaineth an opinion of divinity."

Chrysostom shall conclude, who in his oration against the Judaizing Christians saith, "That

* ἥ τε τῶν πάλαι νεκρῶν μνήμη τῆς μείζόνος ἠξιοῦτο θεραπείας.

† οἱ φαῦλοι Δαίμονες καθυπεκρίνοντο δια πολλῆς τῆς τερατοποιΐας.

‡ Quærite ergo, si vera est ista divinitas Christi: si est ea qua cognita, ad bonum quis reformetur, sequitur ut falsa renuntietur; comperta imprimis illa omni ratione, quæ delitescens sub nominibus et imaginibus mortuorum, quibusdam signis, et miraculis et oraculis fidem divinitatis operatur.

the demons of the Gentiles wrought miracles for the confirmation of Paganism. For," saith he, "they oftentimes by their skill cured diseases, and restored to health those that were sick; what then? should we, therefore, partake with them in their impiety because of this? God forbid." * Then he adds out of Moses, Deut. xiii. that which we even now quoted; which had it been as well applied to the miracles amongst Christians present as it was to those of the Gentiles past, perhaps he that spoke it would have questioned something which he inclined to believe.

* *καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι πολλὰ πολλάκις διὰ τῆς αὐτῶν τέχνης νοσήματα ἀπήλασαν, καὶ πρὸς ὑγιείαν τοὺς κάμνοντας ἐπανήγαγον. τί οὖν, κοινωνῆσαι δεῖ τῆς ἀσεβείας διὰ τοῦτο; μὴ γένοιτο.*

CHAPTER IV.

That Saint-worship was advanced by fabulous legends. This proved from the acknowledged design of the Latin legends, as also of that Greek legender, Simeon Metaphrastes: *particularly his fabulous narrations concerning* Anastasia, S. Barbara, S. Blasius, S. Catharine, S. Margaret, &c.

THE second particular I named of the *hypocrisy* or *feigning of liars*, was fabulous legends of the acts of saints and martyrs. This was also another means to advance the *doctrines of demons*. For the true acts and stories of the martyrs being extinguished for the most part by the bloody edict of Dioclesian, they now began to supply again that loss by collecting such tales as were then current of them, and adding thereto such miracles as were fabled of them after death; fashioned all to the best advantage of what they meant to promote in the Church, and which was already on foot in the same. Such was that wherewith the good father Gregory Nazianzen was abused in his funeral oration upon Cyprian, and many others of the Greek Church; that Cyprian, even that great Cyprian, who was both citizen and Bishop of Carthage in the reign of Decius, (for of him Gregory speaketh expressly,) being formerly a conjurer, and falling in love with a Christian virgin Justina, some say of

Antioch, when by wooing and ordinary me
he could not win her unto his will, he went ab
to prevail with magical spells and conjuratio
which the damsel perceiving, she having recou
to God, fell to work against him with prayer
fasting, and in her devotions also besought
Virgin Mary to succour her a virgin in
jeopardy: by which means Cyprian's magi
enchantments were frustrated, and he, convin
thereby, became a Christian. All which * Ba
nius himself confesses to be a fable; as w
he might, it being unknown both to Pontius
deacon, who lived with him and wrote his li
and to the Western and African Churches wh
he lived and died, who knew (and who cou
know better?) that he was in his Paganism n
a magician, but a professor of oratory at Ca
thage, far enough from Antioch, and convert
by one Cæcilius. Nevertheless we have cause
think that this tale, together with other the lik
served not a little for the advancement of th
mystery of demons in the Eastern Churche
when we see our adversaries so willing to ha
that passage of calling upon the blessed Virgin
be authentical, (as seems by their often allegin
it,) notwithstanding they know, (which th
Greeks so well could not, he being a Latin Bishop,
that the whole story must needs be a fable.

Of this stamp are the well-known legends c
our Latin Churches, which almost all of ther
drive principally at this mark; it being also th
ordinary conclusion of their tales, certainly o

* An. 250. sec. 5.

our English ones, that since God hath done thus and thus by this holy martyr, or since God hath by such miracles honoured this martyr, let us pray unto him, that by his merits and intercession we may obtain salvation. Nor is it a late device; Gregory Turonensis, above a thousand years ago, in his two Books *on the Miracles of the Martyrs;* as his fabulous narrations, which yet many of them he refers to others before him, are excellently well framed for the promotion of Saint-worship; so in the conclusion of them plainly confesses that that was his aim, shutting up his first book thus:—* "It behoves us, therefore, to desire the patronage of the martyrs, that so we may merit, through their suffrages, and by their intercessions obtain that which we are not worthy of upon the account of our own merits." His second thus:— † "And, therefore, let the reader, well considering these miracles, understand that there is no possibility for him to be saved but by the help of martyrs and other friends of God."

But among the Greeks Simeon Metaphrastes hath a strain beyond all, who feigns prayers for many of his martyrs, wherein they desire of God, that whoever should pray unto Him in their names, or have recourse to their sepulchres when they were glorified, might obtain whatsoever they

* Unde oportet et nos eorum patrocinia expetere, ut eorum mereamur suffragiis; vel quod nostris digni non sumus meritis obtinere, eorum possumus Intercessionibus adipisci, &c.

† Ergo his miraculis Lector intendens intelligat, non aliter nisi Martyrum reliquorumque amicorum Dei adjutoriis se posse salvari, &c.

asked—yea, even remission of sins itself. Which because it is so singular a counterfeit of a lying Greek, I shall not do amiss to insert the particulars, together with something about the occasion and time of this device.

In the martyrdom of Anastasia, a Roman virgin, under Diocletian, he tells us, if we be so wise as to believe it, "That at the time of her suffering, when she had, as was fit, given thanks under God, and prayed for the happy accomplishment of her martyrdom, and afterward made suit for those who, being sick, should have recourse unto her, (to wit, after death,) she heard a voice from heaven certifying, that what she had asked was granted her."

Saint Barbara, a virgin of Heliopolis, martyred under Maximianus, he makes, under the executioner's hand, to pray in this manner:—"And thou, O King, (God,) now hear my prayer, that whosoever shall remember thy name, and (this) my conflict, no pestilent disease may enter upon his house, nor any other of those evils which may bring damage or troubles to the bodies of men." She had no sooner spoken, saith he, but a voice was miraculously heard from heaven, calling her and her fellow martyr Julian to the heavenly places, and promising also that those things which she had asked should be accomplished.

Of Saint Blasius, (who suffered, saith Baronius, under Licinius,) our Simeon tells us, "That when a woman came unto him to cure her son, who had a fish bone sticking in his throat, he prayed in this manner: Thou, O Saviour, who

hast been ready to help those who called upon thee in truth, hear my prayer, and by thy invisible power, take out the bone which sticks in this child, and cure him; and whensoever hereafter the like shall befall men, children, or beasts; if any one then shall remember my name, saying, O Lord, hasten thy help through the intercession of thy servant Blasius, do thou cure him speedily, to the honour and glory of thy holy name."

Again he tells us, that while they were carrying him before the president, he restored to a poor widow a hog, her only hog, which a wolf had taken away from her. And when afterward, in sign of thankfulness, she brought the hog's head and feet boiled to the martyr in prison, he, blessing her, spake in this manner:—"Woman, in this habit celebrate my memorial, and no good thing shall ever be wanting in thine house from my God: yea, and if any other, imitating thee, shall in like manner celebrate my memorial, he shall receive an everlasting gift from my God, and a blessing all the days of his life."

When he comes to suffer, he makes him pray to God thus:—"Hear me, thy servant; and whosoever shall have recourse to this thine altar, (he means himself,) and whosoever shall have swallowed a bone or prickle, or be vexed with any disease, or be in affliction or necessity of persecution, grant, Lord, to every one his heart's desire, as thou art gracious and merciful; for thou art to be glorified now and evermore."

When he had thus prayed, (saith he,) Christ descended from heaven as a cloud, and over-

shadowed him; and our Saviour said unto him "O my beloved champion, I will not only d this, but that also which thou didst request fo the widow; and I will bless also every hous which shall celebrate thy memory, and I will fil their store-houses with all good things, for thi thy glorious confession and thy faith which thou hast in me."

Saint Catharine, whom he calls Ægatharina, a martyr of Alexandria, under Maximianus, he makes to pray thus at her martyrdom:—"Grant unto those, O Lord, who through me shall call upon thy holy name, such their requests as are profitable for them; that in all things thy wondrous works may be praised now and evermore."

But, above all the rest, Marina's prayer, whom we Latins call Saint Margaret, is complete and for the purpose. She suffered under Diocletian, and thus she prayed, if you dare believe Simeon:— "And now, O Lord my God, whosoever for thy sake shall worship this tabernacle of my body, which hath fought for thee, and whosoever shall build an oratory in the name of thy handmaid, and shall therein offer unto thee spiritual sacrifices, oblations, and prayers, and all those who shall faithfully describe (O happy Simeon!) this my conflict of martyrdom, and shall read and remember the name of thy handmaid, give unto them, Most Holy Lord, who art a lover of the good and a friend of souls, remission of sins; and grant them propitiation and mercy, according to the measure of their faith; and let not the revenging hand come near them, nor the evil of

famine, nor the curse of pestilence, nor any grievous scourge; nor let any other incurable destruction, either of body or soul, betide them. And to all those who shall in faith and truth adhere to my house (her oratory or chapel) or unto my name, and shall unto thee, O Lord, offer glory, and praise, and a sacrifice in remembrance of thine handmaid, and shall ask salvation and mercy through me; grant them, O Lord, abundant store of all good things: for thou alone art good and gracious, and the giver of all good things for ever and ever. Amen."

While she was thus praying with herself, saith Simeon, behold there was a great earthquake, &c., yea, and the Lord himself, with an host and multitude of holy angels standing by her, in such sort as was perceptible to the understanding, said, "Be of good cheer, Marina, and fear not, for I have heard thy prayers, and have fulfilled, and will in due time fulfil, whatsoever thou hast asked, even as thou hast asked it."

Thus saith Simeon, who nevertheless, in the very entrance to this his tale of Marina, or Margaret, complains much, forsooth, that not a few of these narrations of the acts of martyrs were at the beginning forged, yea, profaned, as he saith more truly than he was aware of, "with the most evident doctrines of demons." (Evidentissimis demoniorum doctrinis.) Besides, he calls I know not what narration of this virgin's martyrdom, in that sort corrupted, a demon story (dictio demoniaca): but for his own part, he would reject all counterfeit fables, and tell us

nothing but the very truth. Which how honest he has performed, and what touchstone he use let the reader judge. Baronius, I am sure, quite ashamed of him*; who though he ca be sometimes content to trade with not muc better ware; yet this of Simeon's, he suppose will need very much washing and cleansing befor it be merchantable.

* In notis ad martyrologium Romanum, Jul. 13.

CHAPTER V.

An useful digression concerning the time when Simeon Metaphrastes lived, and the occasion of his writing. That his living within the time of the great opposition against Saint-worship moved him to devise such stories as made for the credit and advantage of that cause then in danger. A brief historical account (even out of the records left by the adversaries) of the great opposition in the Greek and Eastern Churches against worshipping of Images and of Saints: when it began, how long it lasted, and under what Emperors. Of the great council held at Constantinople *under* Constantinus Copronymus *against Idolatry. An attempt to foist in two canons in favour of Saint-worship frustrated. Several slanders and calumnies fastened upon the Council and the Emperor by the idolatrous faction. The original of these slanders: that they were notorious lies, proved from the decrees of the Council.*

BUT for the better understanding of this mystery of iniquity, and what necessity there was of such desperate shifts when time was; ye shall know that this superstitious Simeon lived towards the end of that time of great and long opposition against idolatry in the Greek and Eastern Churches, by divers Emperors with the greatest part of their Bishops, Peers, and People, lasting from about the year of our Lord 720 till after 840, that is 120 years; which was not against *images* only, though they bare the name; but the *worship of saints and their relics;* the state whereof it will not be amiss to represent out of

such records of antiquity as our adversaries the
selves have been pleased to leave us; if it be
for their sake who so often ask us whether th
were ever any of our religion before Luth
Let us therefore hear what writers of their o
sect, such as then lived and were eye-witnes
will tell us.

Leo Isaurus (saith Theophanes, Miscell. l
21, cap. 23.) "erred not only about t
respective adoration of venerable images," b
about "the intercession of the most cha
Mother of God, and all the Saints, whose reli
also this most wicked man abominated like un
his masters the Mahumetans."

This was the first of those Emperors; the ne
was Constantinus, whom they surnamed Copr
nymus, of whom the same author speaks
followeth: "This pernicious, inhuman, an
barbarous Emperor, abusing his authority tyra
nically, and not using it lawfully, at the ver
beginning made an Apostasy from God and h
undefiled Mother and all his Saints."

Again, lib. 22, cap. 42, upon the twenty-sixt
year of his reign:

"He shewed himself wicked, beyond th
frenzy of the Mahumetans, to all that we
Orthodox"—so he calls idolaters,—"under h
Empire, Bishops, Monks, Laymen and other h
subjects; everywhere, as well by writing as b
speech, banishing, as unprofitable, the intercessio
of the holy Virgin and Mother of God and
all the Saints, through which all succour
conveyed unto us, and causing their holy Reli

to be rejected and despised: and if the Relics of any notable Saint, sovereign both to body and soul, were known to lie anywhere, and were, as the manner is, honoured by those which were religious; presently he threatened such as these with death, as wicked doers, or else with proscriptions, banishment, and torture. As for the Relics acceptable to God, and esteemed by the possessors as a treasure, they were taken from them from thenceforward to be made hateful things."

Again, cap. 48, of the next year:

"If any one getting a fall, or being in pain, chanced to utter the usual language of Christians, saying, O Mother of God, help me; or were found keeping vigils, &c., he was adjudged as the Emperor's enemy, and styled immemorabilis, unworthy of memory: This was a title of infamy."

Again, cap. 54, Anno regni 31:

"If one were found to have a Relic but to keep, (that is, though he worshipped it not,) yet nevertheless did Lichanodraco, the Emperor's President, burn it, and punish him that had it as a wicked doer." Thus far Theophanes.

Hear now what the Author of the Acts of Monk Stephen, whom the same Emperor made one of their Martyrs for patronising idols, can tell us: hear what he saith of the great Council of Constantinople, held in this Emperor's reign against Images.

"O Christ, how should I not admire thy lenity!—To that height did those most impudent

tongues yet further break out, that they were
afraid to utter that monstrous and impious spee
viz. That the very Virgin-Mother of God her
was now after her death unavailable, and no
to be made of her, nor could she help or prot
any one."

The same Author thus deplores the state
those times, abusing the words of Psalm 79.

"O God, the heathen are come into thi
inheritance; thy holy temple have they defile
and made Jerusalem an heap of stones: the de
bodies of thy servants have they given to
meat to the fowls of the air, and the flesh of th
Saints unto the beasts of the earth; that is
saith he, "the venerable and sacred Relics
the Martyrs,* which they cast partly into the fir
partly into the water, and (O villainous ac
whereby the whole world is damnified!) partl
threw down into precipices."

There is nothing yet in these relations will d
any man hurt by engendering a misconceit
especially if he remember the tale is told b
malicious adversaries, that counterfeit Relics wer
plentiful in those days as well as now, and tha
Hezekiah brake in pieces the brazen serpen
made by God's own commandment, a holy monu
ment and a type of Christ, when it was onc
abused to idolatry.

After the death of this Emperor Constantin

* Quas partim igni, partim mari, partim denique (
facinus orbi universo damnum serens!) præcipitiis tra
diderunt;

and his son, who reigned not long after him, the idolatrous faction, under Constantine his nephew and the queen-mother Irene, again for some years prevailed; and that so far as to pack a Council, called the Second of Nice, the Bishop of Rome having a main stroke therein; whereby the former Council of Constantinople was condemned, and the worship of Images again established. But Leo Armenius coming to the Empire, the Orthodox part again prevailed, as before they had done, during the reign of three Emperors more.

The last Emperor of the opposers of Idols was Theophilus, the last Patriarch John. And that to the very end the idolatry of Saint-worship was opposed more or less, as well as that of images, may be gathered out of that "Song of Triumph," which the Greeks used to sing every first Sunday in Lent, for a memorial of their last and final conquest of the opposers of Images, ever since that time; where, in the hymn of Theodorus, Ode 8, I find this verse, "The sacred Relics of the Saints, and their Images, were not at all to be worshipped, said most wickedly the renouncers of piety, the barbarous Lezich and John." This John is that Patriarch of Constantinople which I said was the last of the opposers of idols, and is often mentioned in this song, as is also Lezich, but what he was is uncertain.

But this whole story being delivered unto us only by professed enemies, if they should fasten no worse calumnies upon the opposite side than yet you have heard, you would think perhaps that

the patrons of idols then were far more ingenu
to their adversaries than we find their succes
now. Hear therefore something of this k
also, that you may see, as they agreed with us
the same profession against idols, so did th
also in suffering the like slanderous lies from th
adversaries. In discoursing whereof I shall
nearer to the *hypocrisy of liars* than I v
before.

In that great Council of 338 bishops, held
Constantinople against idols under Constantin
Copronymus, these two canons were, by so
that wished well to saint-worship, though th
consented against images, inserted into the fi
draught of the definition of the Synod; "1.
any one should not confess the holy and ev
virgin Mary, truly and properly *Deipa*
(the mother of God) to be higher than a
visible or invisible creature, and with a since
faith implore not her intercession, let him
anathema. 2. If any one shall not confess a
the saints, which have been from the beginnin
of the world until now—to be honourable befo
God both in soul and body, or shall not entre
their prayers—let him be anathema:" whic
when the definition came to be read in th
council, the prevailing part of the fathers cause
to be blotted out: whereupon that slande
fastened on them by their enemies, may seem t
have taken the first hint; as if, forsooth, by thei
rejecting these two foisted canons, they had
therefore, denied whatsoever was contained i

them; as that the Virgin Mary was Deipara, (the mother of God,) or that the saints were to be honoured so much as with that honourable title of saints.

For Cedrenus would make us believe that this emperor Constantine published a general law, (*θεσμον καθολικον*) "that none of the servants of God should in anywise be called saints: yea, that such of their relics as were found should be despised, and their intercession not to be prayed for; because, said he, they can avail nothing. The profane wretch added, saith the same author, let no man pray for the intercession, no not of Mary, for she can do him no good; moreover, that she should not be called Deipara, that is, the mother of God." (*ἀλλὰ μηδὲ Θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὀνομάζεσθαι.*) Then he tells us, that he compared the blessed Virgin, after she was delivered of Christ, "to a purse emptied of the gold that was once in it." The same with Cedrenus, almost word for word, hath Suidas; so that the one may seem to have been transcribed out of the other.

But Theosterictus, one who lived at the same time, (whereas Cedrenus was more than two hundred and forty years after,) seems much more ingenuous; for in his funeral oration upon Nicetus, a confessor of those times (under Leo Armenius), whose disciple he was, relating otherwise the same thing which Cedrenus and Suidas do, yet when he comes to the story of the purse, he brings in the Emperor expressly calling the Virgin Mary,

Deipara; but finds fault that he would no vouchsafe to her the name saint.*

Indeed it seems that at the wiping out of those forementioned canons, there passed something in the council, as is wont in such disputes, concerning an indifference or lawfulness in ordinary speech to mention such places as were dedicated to the memory of saints, without the addition of the name saint. For I find that Stephen the Monk, afterwards forsooth a martyr, at what time the Emperor sent some of the bishops and others unto him, to require his subscription to the decree of the council, thus expostulates with them: "Did ye not," saith he, "discard this adjective *saint* from all the just, from all the apostles, from the prophets, martyrs, and other godly men? For it was bravely decreed by you, that if any one were going to any of these, and were asked whither he went, he should answer, to the apostles, to the forty martyrs: or being asked whence he came, he should in like manner say, from the temple of the martyr Theodore, from the temple of the martyr George."

But Theostericus tells the same thing of the Emperor Constantine himself.† "He deprived

* Ita Deiparens Maria (neque enim *sanctam* dignabatur nominare illam (saith Theostericus) indignus ille) quo tempore Christum in se habebat, valde honoranda illa erat; ex quo autem tempore illum peperit, nihil differebat a reliquis.

† Sanctos martyres (saith he) quantum in ipso erat, honore privavit, cum præceperit non esse illos sanctos appellandos sed simpliciter nominari Apostolos, quadraginta martyres, Theodorum Georgiam et alios similiter.

as much as in him lay the holy martyrs of honour, in that he commanded they should not be styled saints, but simply named the apostles, the forty martyrs, Theodore, George, &c." Whereby it appears that this law, whatsoever it was which these authors charge the Emperor with, was something that proceeded from the council itself, as Monk Stephen even now charged them. Besides, that it was something only about the calling of places dedicated to saints, though our authors, as calumniators use, tell it of saints at large. Lastly, that it seems to have grown upon some question, how far and in what kind saints were to be honoured, which was occasioned by the wiping out of those canons aforementioned.

Joannes Curopalata and Cedrenus relate, that Michael Balbus, the last save one of the Emperors that opposed idols,* ordained that the word [saints] should not be set upon any images wheresoever they were painted. For this was, and as some say is yet, the fashion of the Greeks, to add the names of the saints to the images which are to represent them. Now if any such thing as this were done or discoursed of in the days of Constantinus, whom they call Copronymus, you may easily guess what fuel it might add to the fire of that slander we speak of.

But why should we trouble ourselves any longer to find out the original of that which we are certain was a notorious lie? For it is apparent in the definition of the council itself, which

* *ἐθέσπισε μὴ τινι τῶν γεγραμμένων εἰκόνων, κἂν που γραφόμεναι τύχοιεν, τὴν* ["ΑΓΙΟΣ] *φωνὴν εγχαράττεσθαι.*

is thus calumniously charged, that they both give the title of saints often to the apostles fathers and others, and of *Deipara* to the blessed Virgin. I shall not need to recount every place where they give the title of saint to particulars hear but what they say in general. "The saints which pleased God, and are by him honoured with the dignity of saintship, though they be departed hence, yet to God they always live."* Again, "It is unlawful for Christians to use the fashions of the Gentiles which worshipped demons or devils, and in a base and lifeless matter (they mean images) to dishonour the saints, which shall one day shine in such and so great grace and glory;" viz., to reign with Christ, and to judge the world, and to be made like to his glory, as they said a little before.† Concil. Nicen. 2. Act. 6. Tom. 4.

As for the other part of the calumny, about styling the Virgin Mary Deipara, hear not only what they practised, but what they expressly decreed.—ibid. Tom 6.‡ "If any shall not

* Sancti qui Deo placuerunt et ab ipso sunt, τῷ ἀξιώματι τῆς ἀγιότητος, dignitate sanctitatis honorati, vivunt semper Deo, licet hinc migraverunt.

† Nefas est Christianis, Δαιμονολάτρων ἐθνῶν, Dæmonum cultricum Gentium moribus uti, et sanctos qui tali et tanta gratia resplendebunt (sc. conregnare cum Christo, et judicare orbem terrarum, et conformes fieri gloriæ ipsius) in ingloria et mortua materia, καθυβρίζειν, contumelia afficere.

‡ Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν εἶναι κατ' ἀλήθειαν τὸν Εμμανουὴλ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Θεοτόκον εἶναι τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον—'Ανάθεμα.

confess Emanuel to be truly God, and, therefore, the Holy Virgin to be *Deipara*, the mother of God—let him be anathema." Here the blessed Virgin hath both the name of saint (αγια) and (Θεοτοκος) mother of God given her. All this you shall find in the sixth Act of the idolatrous council of Nice, where the enemies, whilst they would confute the definition of the Synod at Constantinople, have preserved it, which else had utterly perished, as the Acts thereof have done.

Now judge whether Constantine and his council were guilty or not of what the idolatrous faction charged them with. But we may wonder the less at this notorious impudency of lying companions, seeing we have experience of the like calumnies fastened upon ourselves this day, though there be so many thousand eyes and ears, and writings too, which confute them.

And thus you have seen what manner of times they were about the end of which our Simeon Metaphrastes lived. Was it not high time, think you, for him and those hands to which he was beholden, for I will not charge him with all, to ply the old craft, and reinforce the legends with new lies, when the credit of saint-worship lay thus a-bleeding? It is not credible they would be so much wanting to themselves. And it is as apparent that those tales of the new strain, which we had out of Simeon, were coined in this age, and not before; for if any such thing had been known or delivered from elder times, how came it to pass no notice thereof was given us by any writer of ecclesiastical story, by any father, by any com-

piler or forger of martyrs' lives and miracles, i
now? Certainly so miraculous and wonder
things as voices from heaven, and Christ descen
ing thence in a cloud, and the like, had be
worth the telling. But alas! they could tell
but little of these martyrs, save only the nam
and time of their suffering. And thus I end m
digression, which yet I hope hath not been alt
gether impertinent to the present argument.

CHAPTER VI.

That Saint-worship was promoted by counterfeit writings under the name of antiquity.—That Image-worship and the idolatry of the Mass-god were advanced by the hypocrisy of liars.—This illustrated from several fabulous narrations.—A foul story made use of by the Second Council of Nice in the behalf of Image-worship.

THE last particular of the *hypocrisy of liars*, I made to be *counterfeit writings* under the name of the first and best antiquity; St. Peter's Liturgy, the Liturgy of St. James, of Matthew, of Mark, the Apostles' Council at Antioch; foisted works under the names of Justin, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, and others, through which we need not doubt but the *doctrine of demons* was promoted, when we see some not ashamed still to maintain it by these counterfeit authorities.

Thus you see how the first-born and the most ancient part of the doctrines of demons, the deifying of saints and martyrs, was advanced by the hypocrisy of liars. The same you shall find to have been verified also in the advancing of the next-born demon changling, *image-worship*, and of the third, the idolatry of the mass-god; all brought in and established by the means and ways aforenamed. I need not spend time in historical allegations, they are well enough known; and—Primum in unoquoque genere est mensura

consequentium—by what I said of the first, may judge of those which follow; yet for im I will tell you a story or two for a taste.

Bale, our countryman, (Script. Illust. Bi Cent. 1. c. 91, 99,) relates, that about the 712, one Egwin of Worcester publishe writing certain revelations, yea, express vi he had seen, wherein he was enjoined to se in his diocese of Worcester the image of blessed Virgin, for the people to worship; w Pope Constantine the First having made confirm by oath, not only ratified by his l but caused Brithwald, the Archbishop, to ho council of the whole clergy at London, to c mend them to the people.

In that idolatrous Council, the second of N one of their proofs, among many other the l for worshipping of images, is a tale (quoted of I know not what Sophronius) of a cer recluse, who using to worship an image of Virgin Mary holding Christ in her arms, l been a long time tempted by the Devil to fo cation; whereat on a time, the old man be much aggrieved, the Devil visibly appeari told him in plain terms, but under an oath secrecy, that he would never cease to vex h until he left worshipping the image of the bles Virgin. The monk, notwithstanding the De had made him swear by the Most High he wo tell nobody, yet acquaints one Abbot Theod with the business, who not only allows of l perjury in revealing it, but gives him this ghos

advice.* "It were better he frequented all the stews in the city, than not to worship Christ and his Mother in an image." I am afraid some of this monk's successors still observe this wholesome counsel.

I must tell you also some of the miracles and lies for laying the foundation of transubstantiation, and thence advancing the idol of the mass. A certain monk reports that "he saw Jesus Christ in form of a child sitting upon the altar." Another saith, yea more than one, that "Witikind, King of the Saxons, entering disguised into a church, and diligently observing the Christians' fashion of receiving the communion, saw them put a little pretty smiling boy into their mouths." These wonders, and other the like, of apparitions of flesh and blood, began not till about the end of the eight hundredth year. But that they may seem ancienter, Simeon Metaphrastes, hath a forged legend of Arsenius the Hermit; and somebody counterfeited the life of St. Basil, under the name of Amphilochius his companion, which now they begin to be ashamed of. And for fear the people might suspect that these were illusions, they keep you some of the flesh and blood which was transubstantiated for a monument in many churches. Beside these apparitions, to make all complete,

* *Συμφέρει δέ σοι μὴ καταλιπεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ταύτην πορνεῖον εἰς ὃ μὴ εἰσελθῃς, ἢ ἵνα ἀρνήσῃ τὸ προσκυνεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ μητρὸς ἐν εἰκόνι.*

they tell us of "a hive of bees seen in St. Gerv
"monastery in Paris, that built a chapel of w
"in honour of the host, which somebc
"put into their hive: and a miracle of an
"that left his provender to worship the hos
and many other the like. But I have staid t
long amongst them; and, therefore, let this
the conclusion of the *hypocrisy of liars*, tl
we may pass on to what is yet behind.

CHAPTER VII.

That by these two characters (forbidding marriage and commanding to abstain from meats) are chiefly deciphered monks and friars.—That prohibition of marriage and abstaining from meats are inseparable characters of monastic profession.—That the renouncing of possessions or the having no propriety in anything (another principle in monkery) may be included under the abstaining from meats.—That the word (Βρωματα) *translated meats, implies all things needful for maintenance of life, proved from several places of Scripture.*

I COME now unto the last particular of the description of the means whereby *the doctrine of demons* was to be advanced, viz., "through the hypocrisy of such as forbid marriage, and command to abstain from meats." Who are these? The wonderful correspondence of the event makes me verily believe that the Holy Ghost intended here, at least chiefly, to decipher unto us monks and doctors of monkery, by two such marks as are the chief points and grounds of that singularity of life. For prohibition of marriage and difference of meats are inseparable characters of monastical profession; and, therefore, common to all that crew of hypocrites, whether Solivagant Hermits, or Anchorites which live alone, or Cœnobites which live in society. And if we take them joined together, as our Apostle doth, I think they can befit no

other kind of men by way of rule and precept but these alone. 'Tis true, all Antichrist's priests are forbidden marriage generally and absolutely; but meats they are not, but only upon certain days and times; which is not their case alone, but the people also partake with them in the like restraint. But monks are bound by the vowed rule of their profession to abstain from both, absolutely and perpetually. Concerning the first, hear St. Chrysostom speak, (Hom. 7, in Matthew,)* "All the commandments of God's law are common to us with monks, besides marriage." Wherefore in the Council of Chalcedon is an express Canon, cap. 16, "That no nun or monk should marry," (Ut nec Deo dicata virgo nec Monachus nubant,) *i.e.* they might not forsake their profession.

For the second, the abstaining from meats, St. Benedict can tell us best, who is the father and founder of well-nigh all the monks of the west; his rule, which they all bind themselves to observe, saith, "Let all abstain from flesh." (A carnibus omnes abstineant.) Again, "Let all abstain altogether from the eating of flesh, even of four-footed beasts." (Carnium etiam quadrupedum omnino ab omnibus abstineatur comestio.) Hence is that decree of Bishop Fructuosus in Gratian, Dist. 5. "No monk hath leave granted him to take, or so much as to taste a piece of flesh." (Carnem cuiquam Monacho nec gustandi nec sumendi est concessa

* Nobis and Monachis (saith he) omnia mandata legis sunt communia, πλὴν τοῦ γάμου.

licentia.) And these were the two principal observances of the first monks, before they came to be gathered into a society of a common life, under certain set rules. Paulus Thebæus, the first pattern of this kind of life, abstained, as from marriage, whereof there is no question, so from all meats, save bread and dates. Anthony, the next, ate nought but bread and salt, and both drank no other drink but water. Epiphanius, in his Anchorato, tells us of differing observances in this kind. Some ate no flesh, but fish; some neither, but only fruits and herbs; some ate flying creatures, but abstained from all besides.

But if you will take meats in this place in a larger sense, you shall have a full definition of monkery, and take in that other monastical principle of renouncing possessions, and having no propriety in anything, which they account the second fundamental principle, next to the vow of chastity or single life. Now may not *meats* * be expounded in this sense? We know the word *bread* in Scripture signifies all things needful for maintenance of life, (omnia vitæ subsidia;) and, therefore, we ask them all in the Lord's Prayer, under that name,—"Give us this day our daily bread." Mark the words of David to Ziba, 2 Samuel ix. 10, *Thou and thy sons and thy servants shall till the land for him,* (Mephibosheth,) *and thou shalt bring in the fruits, that thy master's son may have* food *to eat.* Here *bread* or *food* is taken for Mephibosheth's whole maintenance, the whole profit of the lands which

* Βρωματα.

Ziba tills. Matthew x. 9, 10, *Provide neith gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nc scrip for your journey; neither two coats, nc shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat.* Here gold, silver, brass, clothe and staves, all come under the single word *mea* Instead whereof, St. Luke chap. x. 7, puttet *his hire.*† Proverbs xxx. 8, Agur saith, "*Giv me neither poverty nor riches: feed me with* foo *convenient for me.* By all which it appears, tha *food* and *meat* in Scripture is often taken for al necessaries,‡ as St. James speaks (chap. ii. 16, for all provision of things for the use of thi body and this life:—maintenance, revenue estate, possession. Why may not, then, abstain ing from meats in this prophecy mean, or include abstaining from possessions, (votum paupertatis, the vow of poverty and renouncing of the world, as the hypocrites call it? to which the following words § are every way as pliable as to the stricter sense, and may be read thus: *Which God hath created to be enjoyed with thanksgiving of them which, &c.* Let us hear S. Benedict's rule speak for all,‖ "Let no man have anything proper or as his own, no kind of thing, neither book, nor writings, nor inkhorn, nor anything at all." And those who had once imposed upon themselves this law, were prohibited for ever to

* τῆς τρόφῆς αὐτοῦ. † τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.
‡ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος. § εἰς μετάληψιν.
‖ Nemo aliquid proprium habeat, nullam omnino rem, neque codicem, neque tabulas, neque graphiarium, sed nihil omnino.

return to the world again.* "Monks must not return to the world," saith the canon of a great council. Hear a story out S. Hierom, Epist. ad Eustochium:—A certain monk being dead, was found to have been so good a husband as to have had lying by him an hundred shillings, which he had gotten by weaving of linen; hereupon great doubt there was what it should be done withal, whether given to the poor, to the Church, or to what use. But Pambo, Isidorus, and the other fathers (of the monks) laying their heads together, decreed it should be buried with him, with this blessing,† "thy money perish with thee." The like sentence gave Gregory the Great against Justus, a monk, for the like fault. Dial. l. 4. c. 55.

I conclude, therefore, that these words are a description of monkery by such notes as are fundamental, which way soever we take them; either containing *single life* and (discrimen ciborum,) *the differencing of meats;* or the two vows of *chastity* and *poverty;* or all three of them,—*chastity, poverty,* and *abstaining from meats.* As for that other vow of obedience, it was not from the beginning, nor common to all; not to Hermits and Anchorites, but such as lived in common under an head. And these are the men through whose hypocrisy, and by whose means, the *doctrines of demons* should be brought in and advanced among Christians in the latter times.

* Monachis non licere ad seculum redire.

† Pecunia tua sit tecum in perditionem.

CHAPTER VIII.

The monastic life and Saint-worship began much about same time.—That monks and friars (chiefly intended the text by the words forbidding to marry, &c.) were main authors and advancers of Saint-worship, pro from the testimonies of Chemnitius, St. Austin, Greg of Tours, as also, Eunapius, a Gentile writer.—T monks and friars were the ringleaders and chief a vancers of Image-worship, appears in that (during iconomachical controversy in the East) the greatest pa of the storm fell upon those of the monastic professi —That the idolatry of the mass-god was promoted the same persons.

Now, let us see and behold with admiration th truth of this part also of this prophecy. Whe first observe, that this singular kind of life bega even just at the time when the *doctrine of demon* was to enter. For Paulus Thebæus and Anthon the first patterns thereof, died, the former in th reign of Constantine, the latter a little before th year 360, whence, or near unto which, we bega our reckoning before of the first entrance o Saint-worship into the Church. About that time Monks till then having been confined to Egypt Hilarion brought them into Syria, and presently Saint Basil gave them a certain rule to live together in form of a polity, and with the assistance of his brother Gregory Nyssen and Gregory Nazianzen, who all entered this new kind of life, dispersed them over all Asia and Greece

whose increase was so wonderful, that almost in an instant they filled the world; and their esteem was so great, that there was scarce a man of note but took upon him this kind of life.

Though, therefore, it be most true that our Apostle's prophecy will be verified, whichsoever of the two, either such as themselves entered the restraint of a monastic life, or those who approved, taught and maintained the holiness of that profession, as the rest did, were the ring-leaders and foster-fathers of this defection; for both come within the verge of such as *forbid marriage* and *command to abstain from meats;* yet we will not content ourselves with so loose an application, but see what a hand Monks and Friars themselves, chiefly, I suppose, intended by the Holy Ghost, had in this business.

And first, in the first *doctrine of demons, adoring of relics and invocation of saints:* where that which I first speak of shall be in the words of Chemnitius, lest some more tender of the honour of our fathers upon earth, than of the glory of our Father in heaven, might take exception. Hear, therefore, not me, but Chemnitius, in his Examen Concilii Tridentini:—About the year of our Lord, 370,* "by Basil, Nyssen, and Nazianzen, upon occasion of panegyrical ora-

* Per Basilium, Nyssenum et Nazianzenum, in publicos Ecclesiæ conventus, occasione orationum panegyricarum (invocatio sanctorum) invehi incepit, eodem tempore cum ab iisdem authoribus Monachatus ex Ægypto et Syria in Græciam introduceretur. Et videtur (saith he) hæc sive portio, sive Appendix Monachatus fuisse.

tions, invocation of saints began to be brou into the public assemblies of the Church, at same time when by the same authors the p fession of monastical life was brought out Egypt and Syria into Greece; and it seems t this was either a part or an appurtenance monkery, &c." Again, speaking of St. Ambro when he had once turned monk, howsoever was before,* "I deny not," saith he, "t Ambrose at length, when he had once borrow monkery from Basil, began also to incline to t invocation of saints, as appears in his book co cerning widows." Thus Chemnitius.

And that you may yet further see how oper tive Monks were in this business, hear S Augustine, De opere Monachorum, cap. 28 :- † "The Devil (saith he) hath dispersed in eve corner such a crew of hypocrites under the hab of monks, gadding about every country, sent n whither, staying nowhere, everywhere restles whether sitting or standing: some sell the limb of martyrs, (if it be of martyrs,) and all ar asking, all exacting either the expences of

* Non tamen nego (inquit) Ambrosium tandem cu Monachatum a Basilio mutuo sumpsisset, etiam ad invo cationem sanctorum inclinare cæpisse, ut patet ex libr De viduis.

† Tam multos hypocritas sub habitu Monachorur usquequaquam dispersit (Satan,) circumeuntes provincias nusquam missos, nusquam fixos, nusquam stantes nusquam sedentes. Alii membra martyrum (si tame martyrum) venditant—et omnes petunt, omnes exigun aut sumptus lucrosæ egestatis, aut simulatæ pretium sanc titatis.

gainful poverty, or the hire of a counterfeit sanctity." These were those surely which occasioned that rescript of Theodosius, the Emperor,* "Let no man sell, let no man buy a martyr;" whereby we may gather what honesty was like to be used among them. We know,

Laudat venales qui vult extrudere merces.

Merchants use to commend their commodities. Gregory of Tours, who lived and died somewhat before the year 600, tells us this,† "that certain Monks came to Rome, and, near unto St. Paul's Church, in the night time, digged up certain bodies; who, being apprehended, confessed they meant to have carried them into Greece for relics of saints." The same author, l. 9, c. 16, Hist. Franc. relates a story of another counterfeit, a monk, who pretended to come out of Spain, with martyrs' relics; but being discovered, they were found to be roots of certain herbs, bones of mice, and such like stuff; and he tells us there were many such seducers which deluded the people. And he said true; there were many indeed, and many more than Gregory took for such, even those he took for honest men. For though it must not be denied but God had some of this order which were holy men, and unfeignedly mortified, notwithstanding their error in thinking God was pleased with that singularity of life;

† Nemo martyrem distrahat, nemo mercetur.

‡ Monachos quosdam Romam venisse, ac prope Templum Pauli corpora quædam noctu effodisse; qui comprehensi fassi sunt in Græciam se ea pro sanctorum reliquiis portaturos fuisse.

yet must it be confessed that the greater p
were no better than hypocrites and counterfei
and that the lamentable defection of the Chr
tian Church chiefly proceeded from, and w
fostered by, men of that profession, as in pa
we have heard already.

And if you can with patience hear him spea
I will add the testimony of Eunapius Sardianu
a Pagan writer, who lived in the days of The
dosius the First, about the year 400. In the li
of Ædesius, most bitterly inveighing against th
Christians for demolishing that renowned templ
of Serapis, at Alexandria, in Egypt, he speaks i
this manner:—"When they had done, the
brought into the holy places those whon
they call monks; men indeed for shape, bu
living like swine, and openly committing in
numerable villanies not to be named, who ye
took it for a piece of religion thus to despise the
divinity," he means of Serapis; "for then,"
saith he, "whosoever wore a black coat, and
would demean himself absurdly in public, got a
tyrannical authority; to such an opinion of
virtue had that sort of men attained. These
monks also they placed at Canopus, instead of
the intelligible gods, to worship slaves, and those
of no good conditions; thus bringing a bond of
religion upon men. For having powdered the
bones and skulls of such as had been condemned
of many crimes, and punished by a legal course
of justice, they made gods of them, prostrating
themselves unto them, and thinking themselves
the better for being polluted with sepulchres.

They called them forsooth martyrs, and some ministers, yea and solicitors of their prayers with the gods, being indeed but perfidious slaves, who had been well basted with the whip, and carried the scars of their lewdness upon their bodies; and yet such gods as these the earth brings forth."

Thus the wretched caitiff and damned dog blasphemes the saints and servants of Christ, who loved not their lives unto death, the dust of whose feet he was not worthy to lick up. Yet may we make a shift to gather hence what manner of offices monks were then busied in. And if Baronius took leave to use his testimony for the antiquity of saint-worship, why may not I with the like liberty allege it, to shew that monks and friars were ringleaders therein?

But when the idolatry of image-worship came to be added to that of saints, whether monks and friars, were not the chief sticklers therein, judge, when you shall hear how it fared with them in that great opposition against idols in the east.

Of Leo Isaurus, the first of those Emperors that opposed images, we have this in general out of the Greek menology; that he raged most cruelly against bishops and monks which maintained the worship of images; and that he burnt a whole cloister of such kind of people in their monastery, together with a famous library and all their furniture.

But Constantine his son made a worse fray amongst them. For the author of the Acts of Monk Stephen tells us, that he being reproved

and convicted for what he had done, viz., aga
images, by the religious and worthy professor
monastical life, he raised an implacable
against them, calling that noble habit (σκο
ενδυμα), " the vesture of darkness," and the mo
themselves, (αμνημονευτους), " unworthy of
mory," and besides terming them all *idola*
for the worshipping of venerable images.

The same is confirmed by Theosterict
another author of that time, who saith, that
whole aim and study of this Emperor was
extinguish and root out the order of Monks.

And for particulars, hear what Theophan
himself a monk, and a little singed too in t
flame, before it ended, will inform us.

" In the one-and-twentieth year of his reign,
caused," saith he, " Andreas Calybites, a worth
monk, who reproved him for his impiety,"
demolishing images, " to be scourged till he died
Lib. 22, cap. 30. Hist. Miscel.

" In the five-and-twentieth year of his reig
he caused Monk Stephen to be dragged by th
heels in the streets, till, being rent in piece
he died ; both for the aforesaid offence, and be
cause he drew and persuaded many to a monas
tical life." Ibid. cap. 39.

" The same year, the Emperor," saith he
" disgraced and dishonoured the monastical habit
publicly commanding every Monk to lead a
woman by the hand, and so to march through
the Hippodrome, all the people abusing them and
spitting upon them." Ibid. cap. 40.

" In the seven-and-twentieth year," saith he,

"the monasteries partly he destroyed to the very foundations, partly bestowed them upon his captains and soldiers." Ibid, cap. 49.

"In the same year, when he could not draw Peter a Metra, a famous stylite or pillar Monk, unto his opinions, he caused him likewise to be dragged by the heels, and his body cast out into the streets." Ibid., c. 48.

"In his thirtieth year, his prætor, or Deputy Lichanodraco, gathered all the Monks in his jurisdiction together, and commanded them to obey the Emperor, to put on a white coat, and to marry wives instantly, or to have their eyes put out, and be sent into exile." Ibid., cap. 52.

"So the Emperor, when he would have Constantine the patriarch abjure monkery, he made him (saith the same author) eat flesh." Lib. eod. cap. 22.

"In the one-and-thirtieth year, the same Lichanodraco sold all the monasteries, both of men and women, in his jurisdiction, and sent the money to the Emperor. If he found any one to have a relique of any saint in keeping, he burnt it. He slew the monks, some with stripes, some with the sword, and left not a man, where he had to do, that wore a monastical habit; whereupon the Emperor wrote thus unto him,* "I have found thee a man after mine own heart, who fulfillest my whole will." Thus much of Constantine.

The like reports Cedrenus of Michael Balbus,

* Ὅτι εὗρον σὲ ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιεῖς πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.

that he abominated Monks and diversely afflict them, ordaining one punishment after anoth against them. As also of Theophilus the l Emperor that opposed images: Theophilus, sai he, "ordained * that no Monks should ha access unto the cities, and that they should by means be banished,† and not so much as dare be seen in the country;" and that he caused t monasteries and places of holy retirement become common and secular habitations. Wh the reason was, we may learn by what the san author tells us: "of those," saith he, "whi reprehended the Emperor, the Abramite Mon were the chief, who freely adventuring into h presence, did demonstrate that monastical life w not an invention of yesterday or the other da but an ancient and primitive institution; an that holy images were familiar in the apostle times, and that St. Luke painted an image the blessed virgin, &c." But it seems the Em peror was not convinced by their demonstration for this their boldness cost them full dear, as ou author relates.

By this time, I know you understand what th matter was, that this image-storm fell so heavil upon the heads of Monks and Friars; and yet notwithstanding all this, they at length prevailed and carried the day, so God would have it, fo their idols. For another Theophanes, whom the call the Presbyter, a writer also of his time, tell that Theophilus being dead, Theodora the Em

* ἀβάτους τηρεῖσθαι τὰς πόλεις τοῖς μονάχοις.
† μᾶλλον δὲ μηδὲ κατὰ χώραν ὁρᾶσθαι τολμᾷν.

press, (whilst she reigned in the minority of Michael her son,) when she meant to restore image-worship, which had been banished now the second time, ever since Leo Armenius, "when she had acquainted the magistrates and those in authority therewith, together with them she sent for the chiefest of the Monks, and propounded to them the question concerning the restoring of images;" whom when she found all men for the purpose, yea, very eager in the business, she called a synod, whereby idolatry was again publicly erected in the Greek Church, 120 years after it first began to be purged thereof by Leo Isaurus, the Emperor. (w)

For the idolatry of the mass-God, which was not in use, at the soonest, till a thousand years after Christ, when the opinion of transubstantiation had gotten sufficient strength, we shall not need trouble ourselves much, to show that Monks and Friars were the authors and advancers thereof, since by that time these kind of men were become the only masters of divinity; and therefore we need not doubt but what was then broached in the Church came out of their shops. Judge now, by what you have heard, how truly this prophecy of St. Paul is fulfilled, who told us that *the doctrines of demons* should be brought into the Church, *through the hypocrisy of those who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats.*

POSTSCRIPT.

Two centuries are now past, since this importan and striking exposition of Mede, on the Apostasy of the Latter Times, first appeared. I seems natural, then, and almost a sacred duty, ir offering it once more to the Church, to apply the truths which it unfolds with such power and clearness to the actual crisis which threatens us both in Church and in State.

Those to whom the treatise was first addressed have long ago passed from earth, and are now awaiting their account in the day of judgment. A generation, then unborn, has now arisen in their stead. The Spirit, whose express warning is here set before us, is their Lord, and the giver of their life; and they also, whether peasants or statesmen, whether they obey the warning or despise it, must soon pass away in their turn, and will find that by this word, as by every other word of God, they will have to be judged in the great day. It is a solemn inquiry, how far the reviving school of tradition in the Church, or the maxims of expediency now current among our statesmen, will abide this searching trial; or what answer priest or politician will be able

to make, when this warning, now despised or neglected, shall sound once more in their ears at the judgment-seat of their Lord. How many a sentimental delusion, decked out with specious names of antiquity and Catholic tradition, will then be scattered to the winds! The pretences and excuses that now pass current for a national patronage of that idolatry which the Spirit has expressly denounced,—how empty and miserable will they appear, dreams of folly, worthy to be buried in everlasting shame!

For let us view our present state, for a moment, in the light which beams from this holy prophecy. A message of infinite grace and holiness, the glad tidings of God manifest in the flesh, has been sent to the nations of the world with a charge from the everlasting God, that they believe and obey the Gospel. But the Spirit here plainly reveals to us that this message of grace will be corrupted in later times. The nature of that apostasy is distinctly foreshown. Christians would revive in the Church "the Gentiles' idolatrous theology of demons," and thus depart from their faith in the one sole and all-sufficient Mediator, the central doctrine of the Gospel. This evil, he further warns us, would be promoted by the hypocrisy of liars, in pious frauds, pretended miracles, and countless legends; while it would veil its deformity under the fair show of self-denial, in forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats. Every feature of the description has been openly fulfilled for ages, in those latter times to which the apostle

ascribes it, and which are fixed elsewhere to the period which follows the desolation of the Roman empire, while its broken fragments build themselves into a commonwealth of kingdoms. The fall was like that of Israel; and as with Israel, there was to be a partial deliverance before the end, from this captivity of Babylon. Our own Church and others, like the remnant under Zerubbabel, were rescued from the idolatrous and oppressive bondage. The yoke was snapped asunder, and in spite of furious bulls, Armadas without, and plots within, the mercy has been continued to our own day. The second temple may be less glorious than the first, but like the first, it has been cemented by the blood of martyrs; and the candle they lit has never since, by God's mercy, been put out in darkness. They have left, embodied in her services, a full protest against this foretold apostasy, and against those blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits of Rome, in resisting which they loved not their lives unto death. So that her children, in our own day, inherited the noblest of all portions. They were witnesses to all the truths revealed in the first ages of the Church, and to all the truths revived by the Spirit in the hour of reformation; while the Providence of God, by our wonderful empire, seemed to put into their hands the commission of the angel, that they should preach the pure and everlasting Gospel to every tribe and region of the earth. All the signs of its final triumph were unfolding before their eyes, and the Dayspring seemed ready to dawn once

more in redoubled brightness, on a dark and benighted world.

At such a time, and at the moment when a special warning is given us against some mighty spirits of delusion, to work busily in the world, a new school arises within this favoured Church. Its secret aim from the first, and presently its open boast, is to undo the work of the Reformation, to revive the Catholic tradition of those times of apostasy, against which the Spirit has here warned us, and to lead us back by a road, smooth, easy, and inoffensive, to that Egyptian bondage from which God had seemed to deliver us for ever. The warnings of prophecy are slighted. When the express voice of the Spirit of God, denouncing the idolatry of the middle ages, is set before them, the previous question is politely moved, or some refined excuse invented, by which the voice of God's Spirit may be explained in a non-natural sense, and the odious message be buried in silence. Skilful selections from the magazine of demon-worship, attired with all grace and sentimental refinement, are re-appropriated for the benefit of the simple. Fasting and celibacy are once more erected into the main tests of spiritual excellence. To crown the resemblance, the most lying legends of the dark ages are carefully refined from their grossness, and turned into love philters to seduce the hearts of the young, the lovers of sentiment, wonder, and mystery, into a yearning for Rome as their natural mother, and a hatred for the Christian severity of Protestant truth.

Every thing here is mournful, and inde
hateful. That we should reject and despise t
clear warnings of God's Spirit; that we shou
slight mercies so varied and wonderful as tho
which rescued us from our bondage, and ha
preserved to us a pure Gospel until now; th
when the land of promise was full in view, wi
the brightness of millennial glory inviting u
onward to labour, and hope, and prayer, in th
prospect of Messiah's kingdom, we should tur
back in our hearts to the Egypt where th
witnesses of God had been slain, and their corps
had been unburied; that we should reject th
word of God for the traditions of men, th
Gospel of salvation for episcopal genealogies, a
endless as useless, and so expressly condemne
by the Spirit along with mere fables; the hope o
eternal glory for the barren retrospect of ages o
chivalry and bloody superstition; all this is no
only a miserable folly, but must be a fearfu
wickedness in the sight of God. Clothe it a
we may with the colouring of fancy, adorn it a
we may with the fair titles of antiquity, and
Catholic tradition and consent of the fathers, i
is a poor and wretched counterfeit of heavenly
things, and must vanish, like the shadows o
night, when once the King of Glory shall appear

But there is one view of this subject which
recent events, compared with the prophecy, seem
to force on our notice; and which is like a
Divine beacon to preserve us from being led
astray by the subtle delusion, however fair the
spiritual pretences under which it may be veiled

Now the Spirit of God, in this express warning of the Latter Day Apostasy, seems to mark the means of its introduction, even more than the false system itself, with His sternest reprobation. It was to be brought on "through the hypocrisy of liars." The term is peculiar; and implies, not the lie of a moment, untrue assertions of simple facts, but laborious compositions, oratory or poetry, set speeches or fabulous legends, leavened with conscious duplicity or tortuous falsehood. In this manner the description was amply fulfilled, as Mede has shewn in the lying legends of the Monks to promote idol-worship in the Church. Such falsehoods are doubly hateful to the Holy Spirit. His very name is the Spirit of Truth. And while all false doctrine is odious in his sight, because he knows how ruinous it is to the souls of men, religious fraud is still more hateful, because it is a direct and open affront to him, as the moral Governor of the world; and hence it is the sin which stands out with the darkest shades in this solemn warning.

And does not the same fatal mark still attach itself, in our own day, to the reviving apostasy of ascetic pretensions and idolatrous superstition? However amiable, however honest in their natural character, however noble the tone of sentiment that may at times flow from their lips, do not the votaries of the predicted delusion appear attracted, by a sure and secret instinct, within the range of the infection, till the same plague-spot of corruption reappears? When parts of the

mass-book are republished for the benefit of Er
lish churchmen, to be reappropriated once m
to their private or public use, and idolatrous
vocations are inserted on the plea that *they* a
in no danger from them, is there no seemi
ground for the Spirit's warning? When a fe
hard speeches against Rome are inserted amic
laboured defences of Romish doctrines, not b
cause the writers really meant them as true, b
because they were necessary to their positio
has not the whirlpool of hypocrisy begun to su
them into its vortex? When the plea for puttir
a Romish construction on Protestant formularie
is to restrain the Rome-ward tendencies in tl
Church, who can fail to catch some echo of tl
Spirit's severe description? When railing charg
are brought against the Reformers, for denyin
the moral supremacy of conscience, and the railer
illustrate that supremacy by turning the mo
solemn subscriptions of faith into a plaything c
verbal trickery, who can fail to see that th
patronage of that saint-worship which the Spiri
has forbidden, by a strange fatality, compel
those who might naturally be most truthful an
honest, to borrow from "the hypocrisy of liars?"
When hundreds, again, combine to celebrate, a
a noble triumph for the Catholic cause, the pro
longing, for a few weeks or months, within the
Church, of a practical license for systematic and
revolting perjury, who that has any love for
honesty left can fail to mourn in secret for the
hateful omen, and while he mourns, to catch

still the echo of those ominous words, "through the hypocrisy of liars?" The degrees of infection may be various. Some may sear their conscience and blind their eyes, till they can subscribe solemnly to the truth of formularies, which, in their view, are lies and heresies as plain as words can make them. Others may refrain from such practices, and only "take pleasure in them that do them;" while others may only palliate, by gentle titles, the perjury of which they disapprove. But just in proportion as saint and image-worship become the ruling passions, natural honesty dies away, and is replaced by tricks and contrivances, by laboured distinctions without a difference; till even Charity herself, who covereth all things and believeth all things, is compelled to believe also the warning of the Spirit, and to remember that the apostasy first came in "through the hypocrisy of liars." May God, of his infinite mercy, open the eyes of those who have been deceived, till they stand on the very lip, or are already sucked far into the vortex of a sin so fearful! But may he also preserve our Church from the fate of Eli, who in his old age *fell backward*, and brake his neck; in punishment for his sin, because, though upright himself, the priests, his sons, "made themselves vile, and he restrained them not." May no apathy of her members, or no supineness of her rulers ever betray the ark of God's truth into the hand of enemies, and sink our nation in double guilt and perpetual ruin!

But the prophecy throws no less light on

another aspect of the evil, the doctrines wh
now pass current among our statesmen, and re
paramount in our national counsels.

What is our real state, and that of our leg
lators, in the sight of God? A few hundreds
immortal and responsible beings, reared fro
infancy to manhood by the gracious hand
their Maker, are invested by his sovereign pow
for a little moment with control over the laws
a mighty Empire; an Empire which has t
whole world at its feet, vast and unexampled
the wide range of its dominions, the influence
its name, and the means it possesses of furtheri
truth and righteousness through the earth. T
living and eternal God, by whom kings reign an
princes decree justice, stands perpetually in the
assembly, and "is a judge among the gods," as h
styles those earthly lawgivers who are the shado
of his own supreme dominion. He has raised the
from the dust to an office of overwhelming dignit
on which the temporal and spiritual welfare
countless millions depends. He has also give
them His word, plain, simple, and clear, in i
commands and warnings, to be the guide of the
counsels, and the pure and full fountain of a
national wisdom. And while that word revea
the Gospel of Christ, in its purity, holiness, an
freedom, as the true source of all nation
blessings, the Spirit expressly warns them of on
grand corruption of the faith, idolatrous in i
essence, persecuting in its spirit, usurping pow
over the states and kingdoms of the west, an
the sure cause of His heavy judgments to tho

rulers and people, who foster its idolatries and partake of its sins.

What then are the maxims, on which the children of a day, so highly exalted and honoured, administer their solemn trust, for which their account will quickly have to be given? Their own laws are spread through volumes without end, full of verbiage and cumbrous forms, which few can understand. Yet they are enforced by penalties on the whole nation. All are supposed responsible for a knowledge of their meaning, though judges themselves can often hardly discover it; and the property, the liberty and the life of millions, are made to depend on their obedience. To make the difficulties of interpreting their laws, however real, nay, often insuperable, absolve the subjects from their authority, is felt to be an evil that would lead to anarchy and destroy the nation. Even their own unwritten privileges, defined solely by their own will, perhaps by a casting vote, are so precious in their eyes, that those who transgress them, even in obeying, as they fancy, the law itself, however conscientious, are to be visited with punishment for the crime. They pity, but they imprison; they lament the hard necessity, but still the law of the judge, and the conscience of the subject must give way, that privilege may reign supreme. But when the question is of the laws of God, the privilege of the Most High to rule among the nations, and to have His will supreme in the councils of His own creatures, all is suddenly reversed. True, His laws are written laws, not vague, undefined

decisions of a floating majority. They are one volume, accessible to all, not spread thro countless folios. Their language is clear, sim and lucid, not clothed in verbiage, and le expletives without end. We might natur have inferred that if imperial laws, and e privileges, are binding on subjects, much m must the word of God be binding on t conscience, and in the public measures, of stat men and legislators themselves. But we for one weighty difference. The laws that are binding are the enactments of an imperial leg lature; the truths which our legislators m safely and wisely set aside are merely the everla ing commandments of the God of heaven. Ther fore it is best to shut them out of our counse They are religious questions, and we cannot ente tain them. The laws of heaven are too unce tain, we cannot venture to say what is the meaning, or whether they mean anything at a Perhaps they forbid the worship of image but it is a knotty and difficult point, on whic every one must have his own opinion. Perha the Spirit may have given an express warnin against saint-worship and human mediators, b we dare not decide. We have a chance of bein right in our view, but so have others. Therefo with God's laws, as legislators, we have nothin to do. Perhaps Popery may be idolatry in t sight of the living God, but that is not o business; it is well and expedient to endow i Perhaps the everlasting Spirit of God, on who our life depends, may have warned us against i

but prudence requires us to give it a little support. Perhaps God may have told us in the statute-book of heaven that the nations which partake of its sins shall receive of its plagues. But it is a knotty inquiry, and relates to a very distant time, and we will not trouble ourselves about it. No gleam of religious light must break in on the sacred gloom of our deliberations. Expediency must be our rule, present State convenience our pole star, and we will take our chance for the blessing of the God of heaven. We enforce our own laws and privileges by fine and imprisonment, perhaps even by death; but surely He will never expect us to attach any meaning to his words, much less to obey them. We have only some floating opinions about them, more or less probable, and that is all. Let bigots speak of the sin of patronising idolatry, and pretend that His words have a definite sense, and that statesmen and all their politic schemes will be judged by that sense at the last. But enlarged and liberal thinkers will see clearly that God never meant us to have a certain knowledge of His truth, or to make it the law of our private conduct and of our national counsels.

These are the maxims, when stripped of their specious disguise, which seem now ready to be taken up by statesmen of all parties, as the guides of our legislation. The great apostle of the Gentiles adopted the resolution for his guidance, "Let God be true and every man a liar." The first Gentile kingdom seems now adopting for its rule of public conduct the exact

reverse. Let the laws of Parliament be alwa presumed to have a true and definite sense; b the words of God be reckoned to have a meaning, at pleasure, or none at all. And wh is the painful and monstrous result? Th members of a Church which declares the wo ship of the host "an idolatry to be abhorred all faithful Christians," count it wise and prude to bestow a growing share of the public revenu to inoculate the land with that very idolatry an kindred abominations. Amidst the brilliant gla of eloquence in our halls of state, when th light of heaven has first been carefully excluded this will be styled a profound and liberal polity a lofty superiority to narrow prejudice, a mighty advance on the road of sensible and enlightene legislation. But a more serious question remains how such maxims will appear in the judgmen day, when this express warning of the Spiri shall be found really to have had a meaning when God will shew to the universe that his word was given to be understood, that he really meant it to be obeyed, and that judgments were in store both for indolent neglect, and wilfu disobedience?

Now if it is indeed henceforth to be the first law of British legislation, that God's word cannot be understood, that Popery or heathenism are to be fostered and encouraged, because they exist, and that statesmen may not trouble themselves abou religious truth or falsehood; but may wisely promote Christian truth with one hand, and idolatrous corruptions which God has denounced on the other; let the fact be openly avowed, and

not covertly and treacherously assumed. Let the coronation oath be at once set aside, and the new fundamental law instituted in its room; and confirmed, as due consistency requires, not by an appeal to the living God, but to the sovereign people. Christians have seen with joy, over the noble mart of our commerce, a nobler acknowledgment of God's power and supreme dominion; a testimony all the more delightful, because it came from the very side of the throne. But if the policy of religious indifference is henceforward to prevail, why should not its disciples enjoy a similar triumph? When the new Houses of Parliament are complete, why not emblazon a text equally descriptive over the portals, and inscribe them with the appropriate sentence, WHAT IS TRUTH? The warning would then be fairly given to young and unfledged senators, on which principles they were to exercise their trust. In private they may be still as pious as they please, sincere, hearty Protestants, and true Christians. But there will then be a clear understanding that when they legislate for the empire at large, they must do it on Pilate's maxim; and not by the laws of Him whose name is the Truth, and whom that same Pilate crucified. Then the wheels of liberal legislation will not drive on so heavily, amidst popular prejudice without, and lurking scruples of conscience within. The defecation may then be complete. The new halls of debate may never once be vexed with odious appeals to the word of God, and questions of religious truth or falsehood. The prudent and politic measures of statesmen can then be

argued on simpler grounds, with the mutual consent and applause of all parties, and no breath of fanaticism disturb their philosophical debates. When the maxim engraven on the portals has once been duly impressed on our youthful senators, and the disciples of Pilate have made some proficiency in his school, how simple and easy will be the solution of knotty questions of State! No uncharitable suspicions that there is really such a thing as Christian idolatry, and that God's anger is declared against it, will interfere with the easy course of legislative wisdom. The whole question, as once of old, will lie in a narrow compass. Is there a grave pressure from without? Is there an urgent and overwhelming State necessity? Does the census read clearly—so many Roman Catholics in Ireland; so many more Mahometans and Hindoos in the East? Is it expedient that truth shall be sacrificed and Popery endowed? Then we hesitate no longer; we "give sentence that it shall be" as State necessity requires. It will be soon enough to attend to religious scruples at the judgment-day, if it should ever arrive; or if statesmen should not, as we hope they perhaps may, be allowed to plead there also the privilege of Parliament.

It is humiliating, it is mournful, to see men of talent, worldly wisdom, men of high honour in their private dealings,—in their public capacity, and where the welfare of a mighty empire is at stake, surrender themselves, almost with one consent, to so gross and senseless a delusion. If Christianity be untrue, and the word of God be

a lump of potter's clay, to be moulded into sets of opinions at each man's pleasure, let us lay aside our faith as an antiquated folly, and, in public and private equally, profess ourselves the disciples of modern Infidelity. Let us avow boldly that our business, as statesmen, is to help on a new era, in which man himself and his wonderful discoveries shall be the sole object of our worship. But if we are Christians indeed, let us be Christians everywhere and at all times. If in private we hate idolatry as an abomination, and mourn and pray for those deceived by its subtle delusions, let us not be guilty of the enormous folly and crime of using our power, as statesmen, to promote its spread; and thus virtually labour to sink the souls of thousands into eternal ruin.

And this leads to one further remark, which may serve for a practical application of the whole inquiry. The evil which threatens our land, both in the Church and the State, is imminent and extreme. But the Spirit of God here suggests to us a plain and simple remedy; and may he give grace to our priests and our statesmen, as well as to our countrymen, to adopt it for themselves, and require it in all those over whom they have power! That remedy is the contrast of the disease. The Apostasy, we are told, crept in "through the hypocrisy of liars;" and, in every step and form of its revival, the same fatal plague-spot re-appears. Let us resolve, then, as Christians, as clergy, and as statesmen, to be simply honest, and the tide of

delusion would be stemmed at once, and
Church and our country be saved from
impending judgment.

First, in the Church itself, though we may
yet see eye to eye, though some may place
cipline higher, and others lower, on the scal
relative importance; though some may s
unity in outward forms, and some in the tru
of the Gospel with more outward freedom;
thing at least let us resolve, to be simply hon
We may not perhaps be able to expound, w
logical acuteness, the higher mysteries of our fa
or to thread our way through all the labyrinth
ancient tradition. We may be dim-sighted in
view of the prophetic claims of the Church, and t
shades which discriminate the doctrine of purg
tory and prayers for the dead. But we may
least, every one, be upright and sincere. Let
resolve to make no statements, because they a
"necessary to our position," but because v
honestly believe them to be true. Let us n
profess unlimited obedience to bishops as t
visible delegates of Christ, whose lightest wor
are binding on our conscience, and defame the
as heretics the moment that they cross our ow
path or contradict our own theories. Let us n
profess a hearty desire to preserve men fro
Romish error, and inoculate them, at the san
time, with the whole cycle of Romish doctrin
Let us weave no chain of garbled quotations,
prop our views by a seeming warrant fro
authorities that really oppose them. If we u
happily are so blind as to count the Reformati

While we cease not to pray for our country and its rulers, we shall do well, in this case, to inure our hearts to a sterner prospect, when God shall vindicate his forgotten claims, and the King of kings himself shall both purge his floor and cleanse his sanctuary, and arise in his majesty to shake terribly the earth.

NOTES, &c.

NOTE (a) p. 100. Cutting and lancing were fune
rites, as appears Lev. xxi. 5; xix. 28; Deut. xiv. 1; a
Jer. xvi. 6; xlviii. 37; and, therefore, retained in t
funeral worship of those that were deified after dea
Quære. Did not God forbid his people this rite,
abused to demon-idolatry? Yet did some transgr
it, Jer. xli. 5. Moses' body was therefore hidden.
may add that for this cause, Scripture calls those fa
gods *g'atsabim*, which signifies *θεοὶ ὠδυρμένοι, such had been mourned for*, being dead. The word is us
of David's mourning for Absalom. *Quære.* Wheth
g'atsabim signifies so properly the images, as t
supposed gods themselves? See Psalm cvi. 36, 3
where *g'atsabim* is explained to be *shedim*, devils. S
Isaiah xlviii. 5, where *g'atsab* is distinguished fro
graven and molten images. Where the word seen
otherwise, it may be a metonymy. Hence Hosea xiii.
may be interpreted, *They have made molten images
their silver, which in their opinion, are* g'atsabin
inspired, as they supposed, with those mourned-f
ones.

That these *Baalim* were the deified souls of th
dead, is manifest from divers places of Scripture
Numbers xxv. 2, 3, The Midianites *called the people t
the sacrifices of their gods, and the people did eat. An
Israel joined himself to Baal-peor.* But Psalm cvi. 28
it is said, *they joined themselves to Baal-peor, an
ate the sacrifices of the dead.* Whence Apollinariu
calls it, *νεκρείαν ἑκατόμβην.* In the prophetical song
of Israel's apostasy, Deut. xxxii. 15, *They sacrificed t
devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not; to neu
gods that came lately up, which their fathers feared not.*

The Seventy, δαιμονίοις, Hebrew, *leshedim*. See Isaiah lxv. 8, *idolaters in tombs*, and viii. 19, *for the living to the dead*. The Targum renders, *Is not this the way of the people that worship idols? Every nation inquires of its idol, the living of the dead*. The Seventy thus, οὐκ ἔθνος πρὸς θεὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκζητήσουσι; τί ἐκζητήσουσι περὶ τῶν ζώντων τοὺς νεκρούς; In Isaiah lxv. 3, 4, the Targum thus, *In hortis sacrificant idolis, et adolent aromata super lateres: qui habitant in domibus quæ ædificantur de pulvere sepulcrorum, et cum cadaveribus filiorum hominum morantur*. The Seventy, αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις, καὶ θυμιῶσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς πλίνθοις τοῖς Δαιμονίοις ἃ οὐκ ἔστι. Ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις κοιμῶνται δι' ἐνύπνια. See Targum on Isaiah xxvi. 14. Many texts might be adduced about the *Rephaim* whom Moses mentions. Also Jerome on that text of Isaiah, by *other Lords*, understands *idols and false gods;* by the *giants* and *dead*, verse 14, *the images* and *the demons* who are present with them.

(b) p. 106. Jerome on Ez. xxiii. "The idol Baal or Bel, is the worship of the Assyrians, consecrated by Ninus the son of Bel, in honour of his father." The same on Hos. ii. "Ninus came to such honour, that he promoted his father Belus to a god, who is called in Hebrew, Bel, both in many of the prophets, and in Daniel; and according to Theodotion, along with the idol of Babylon, he is called by this name. The Sidonians and Phenicians call him Baal."

(c) p. 106. Eusebii Chron., Chronic. Alex., or Fasti Siculi. Jerome, after the place just cited. Didicimus exordium dæmonis, imo, homines in dæmonium consecrati. On Is. xlvi. "Quem Græci Belum, Latini Saturnum dicunt; cujus tanta fuit apud veteres religio, ut ei non solum humanas hostias captivorum ignobiliumque mortalium, sed etiam suos liberos immolarent."—Cyrill. adv. Julian. Book iii. near the end. "Primus regnavit in Assyriorum terrâ, ἀνὴρ αλάζων καὶ

ὑπερφρυς ἄρα Βῆλος, qui et primus hominum die a subditis nomen Deitatis accepisse." Here the terpreter falsely renders *Arbelus;* and presently, Βήλου γέγονεν ὁ Νῖνος—the interpreter, *Arbeli,* Lactantius de Fals. Rel. c. 23, refers the origin of idola to Belus.

(d) p. 109. The soul-gods were called *Dii animal* of whom *Labeo* had written books; in which "aie (Serv. Aen. l. 3,) esse quædam sacra quibus anim vertantur in Deos, qui appellantur *Animales,* quod animabus fiant." See Lex. Martin. under *Lar,* a his extracts from Varro.

Plutarch *de Defect. Orac.* in the person of Amm nius the philosopher, makes two sorts of demons, διακριθεῖσαι σώματος, ἢ μὴ μετασχοῦσαι τὸ παράπα ψυχαὶ, *souls separated from bodies, or such as nev dwelt in bodies at all.* Though both sorts have th name of Demons given them in common, yet thos which once were souls of men, for distinction, a called heroes; though some extend not this name i general to all; but only to such as are of inferio rank, or but novices, not yet promoted to the office o demons, as advocates not yet called to the bar.

(e) p. 110. See Athenag. Legat. pro Christ "Non desunt qui dicant, μὴ εἶναί τε ἕτερον τρόπον τοῦ θεοῖς ἢ τούτων προσελθεῖν, non alio modo (quam pe simulacra) homines convenire deis posse." Tertull. d Idol. c. 7, "artifices idolorum dæmoniis corpora con ferre."

(g) p. 114. See Herod. Clio. c. 35, Πέρσα ἀγάλματα ἢ νηοὺς καὶ βωμοὺς οὐχ ἱδρύεσθαι ὡς ἐμ δοκέειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρωποφυέας ἐνόμισαν τοὺς θεοὺ κατάπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες, εἶναι.

Constantin. Or. ad Sanct. Coetum c. 4. τῷ γάρ τ ληπτὸν, οὔτε μόρφην ἐπιγνοθεῖ δι' ἧς γνωρισθείη, οὔτ σχήματος ἀνέχεται, ὡς ἂν εἰκόνος ἢ τύπου· ταῦτα δ πάντα γίγνεται πρὸς χάριν τῶν κατευχομένων· ἄνθρωπ γὰρ ἦσαν ἥνικα ἔζων, σώματος μέτοχοι ὄντες.

"In mortuorum idolis dæmonia consistunt." Tert. de Spectaculis. See almost the whole of cc. 11, 12, 13.

(h.) p. 152. But it may be said, if idolatry and spiritual fornication be the charge, why should not this rather be laid on Paynims, and Turks, and Saracens, who acknowledge not Christ, rather than on Christians who do?

I answer, St. Paul and St. John prophesied of a thing to come, not of that which was in being when they prophesied. But ethnic and Payanism idolatry at that time overwhelmed the whole earth, yea and persecuted and made war with the saints; and no time hath yet been when this idolatry was not to be found.

Again, neither Saracen nor Turk, the greatest un-Christian states since Christ, can be the Antichrist, we speak of; nor their blasphemy the *mystery of iniquity* foretold by prophets and apostles.

For there are two unquestionable characters of that mystery, which will neither of them, still less both of them, agree to Turk or Saracen; namely, first, that it should sit in that great city which in St. John's time reigned over the nations of the earth. Secondly, that it should be an apostasy from the Christian faith once embraced. But the Turk, whatsoever he be, is no apostate, being of a nation which never was Christian. Nor was the seat of the Saracen empire, while it stood, either in the old or new Rome, or near unto either. For I would seem to yield, from this time, that new Rome or Constantinople might serve the turn, though I am far enough from believing it. Nor will I allege that Mahomet himself and his nation were both Paynims, when they began their blasphemy, for you will tell me that Sergius the monk taught him to make the Koran. Nor will I question now whether the Christian or the Mahomedan be the greater idolater, though the doubt might soon be resolved, seeing it is well known that the Mahomedans worship no images. But I have alleged nothing but what is without ex-

ception, that both these characters cannot be applied either to Turk or Saracen, though I believe that neither can be. When I spake of Paynims and Mahometans, I would have you remember that there were some blasphemous sects in the first ages of the Church, which are no more to be accounted of as Christians than Mahometans and Paynims are; nay, Mahometanism is nearer Christianity than many of them were. For amongst whom the Christian's Deity is not received nor worshipped, these, though they spring up in imitation of Christianity, I account but new Paynim blasphemies, and not Christian heresies. Such were the Cerinthians, Marcionites, Salumins, Valentinians, and Manichees; which neither professed the same deity nor acknowledged the Divine word which we Christians do. But the Mahometans worship the same God with Jews and Christians, God the Creator of heaven and earth, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; howsoever they conceive otherwise of his nature and properties than Christians do.

[This last sentiment is at least doubtful, though the inquiry which it opens is one of great difficulty, as well as of deep interest. It is plain that different objects of worship may still have common attributes ascribed to them. Certainly 1 John ii. 23 seems at the first sight directly opposed to this last statement of Mede; and he seems half disposed to retract it himself, as appears from another remark.]

(k) p. 200. [Many have objected to the reckoning of the Greeks as one of the ten kingdoms. And certainly, as here loosely explained, "the Greeks in the residue of the Empire," the objection is forcible. But when the Greek exarchate in Italy is taken for one horn, the objection ceases to apply. That government was within the territory of the Western Empire, and practically almost independent of the Eastern Emperor, and seems to answer all the features of the emblem; certainly as well as Mohametanism, which began in Arabia, and

spread from India to Spain, can represent a horn of the eastern empire.]

(l) p. 201. [This list has the serious objection that one of the three uprooted horns does not enter into the previous list, nor was either the Frank. or German empire plucked up by the roots before the Papacy. There is no reason, in my opinion, to doubt that the three uprooted powers are the Heruli, the Ostrogoths and the Lombards, as explained by Allix and Faber. See also "Four Proph. Empires, chap. x.," where the subject is unfolded at greater length.]

(m) p. 207. [This explanation is at least open to very serious doubts. For first, it is much more probable that the Epistles of St. John were written twenty years after the fall of Jerusalem. And next, these Antichrists, or false prophets, are plainly mentioned as forerunners of *the* Antichrist, who was to be revealed when the Roman Empire was broken. But where this event was directly referred to, it would be unnatural to suppose the fall of Jerusalem, so much earlier, to be meant as the close or limit of the last time. Nor has the Epistle at all the air of minute chronological distinctions. St. John calls it rather the last time, because the moral features of the Antichrist, who was to arise in the latter times of the Church, had begun to appear.]

(n) p. 208. [This interpretation of Heb. x. 35—37, is much more plausible than the former; since that Epistle was clearly written a few years before the fall of Jerusalem. And yet even here a closer view will lead us to entertain very strong doubts of its truth. See Horsley's sermons on this subject. The promise which these Christians were to receive, and which was to sustain their confidence, was not surely the threatening that the temple would be overthrown, and the nation scattered. The whole tone of the Epistle proves that the Hebrews would rather view this as a drawback on their hopes than as the hope itself. The truth seems to be that they regarded that event as a

necessary preparation for the coming of Christ fro heaven, the real hope for which they were lookin and had the impression that only a short interval, com paratively, would separate them. Hence the visibl nearness of the one would deepen their impression the rapid approach of the other also, though taugh that a revelation of Antichrist was to intervene.]

(o) p. 211. [It may still be doubted whether, fo once, Baronius may not be nearer the truth than Med in the remarks which close this chapter. It would b a conceit, "little better than blasphemous" to suppos the inspired Scriptures to contain errors and mistake due to the ignorance of the apostles. But it is very different to suppose the Holy Spirit used expressions by them, with the enlarged meaning for which h himself has supplied the key (2 Pet. ii. 8); and yet tha the apostles, in their own impression and judgment o the times, which were not given to them to know (Acts i. 6,) understood them in a narrower and humar sense. This is natural in itself, and confirmed by th plain analogy of the prophets, who had to search fo the meaning of the times they announced with thei own lips (1 Pet. i. 11); and therefore nothing can b less blasphemous nor more probable than the opinion when properly explained.

Again, the reasons alleged are by no means able t disprove this opinion. When three-fourths of exposi tors now reject Mede's own date of the seventy weeks and with much reason, for one near forty years earlier the first proof of delay could have no force with th apostles themselves. The second, third, and fourth events, they might contract, in their own presentiments within little more than a generation; and the event of the last fifty years may show us that there wa nothing in this abstractedly impossible. The fifth an sixth, nearly all the early Church, for three centuries placed after the Advent, and therefore it is natural t infer that the apostles, in their private opinion at th

very least, would do the same. The seventh event, the coming of scoffers, had earnests so ample in their own days, that it could form no barrier to their expectation of the end. On the contrary, it would naturally dispose them to view the Advent as near, when so many blasphemies began to be invented by the heretics of those days. We are told, also, of the apostles personally, and not merely of other Christians of their age, that it was not given them to know fully the times and seasons. A comparison of their sayings with each other, and with the words of the elder prophets, and the canon of 2 Pet. ii. 6, will prove clearly the foreknowledge of delay in the Spirit who inspired them, and will supply a key to the expressions in separate passages. But still those separate passages, taken without such a key, may very possibly give a more exact view of what the apostles, in their own minds, conceived, with regard to the shortness of the delay.]

(p) p. 214. [This note or mark, by which Mede was guided, as he thought, to the true application of the prophecy in Daniel, has itself been made, by several more recent expositors, a main reason for rejecting his interpretation. For they allege that "the desire of women" which he referred, like all the ancients, to marriage, or conjugal affection, has no such meaning; that the Hebrew idiom proves it to mean an object of woman's desire, and that the context shews it to be a divinity; and hence that it denotes the Messiah, whose birth was an object of desire to Jewish women.

There are two presumptions which lie, at first sight, against this view, however ingenious and fascinating on a rapid glance. First, it is strange in this case that all early writers, without exception, Jewish or Christian, take for granted that the lawful or unlawful love of women is intended. And next, there seems no ground for ascribing to women in general, what was true, at the most, of the believing daughters of Israel.

A closer search supplies a still more decisive disproof. The word *chemdath*, used here for *desire, never once denotes the object* of desire; but in its primary meaning, the *emotion* itself, and in its secondary meaning, the *pleasantness* or *beauty* which occasions it. Hence the phrase must here have one of three meanings; the emotion of desire which women feel; emotions of desire of which they are the object; or, finally, female beauty, which awakens those emotions. The first is clearly foreign to the scope of the text, and the two others are in substance one and the same, and both of them agree well with Mede's interpretation, and with all the early versions. One only objection remains to this view. It is thought that the context proves the *desire of women* to denote an object of worship. But this is by no means required by the words of the angel. The statement is more comprehensive, if we suppose the word, *all*, to denote "all human instincts and passions." Of these the two chief, answering to the two tables of the law, are the religious and the social. The wilful king magnifies himself above all the *religious* instincts of mankind, by his rejection of the gods of his fathers, and against all *social* instincts, by rejecting that ordinance from which all social relations flow as their common fountain. The exposition of Mede has therefore no difficulty from this phrase, but rather a strong confirmation.]

(p) p. 217. So the *Targum Onkelos* and Jonathan both render it expressly. Servies populis (פלחי מעוהא) servientibus idolis.—Deut. xxviii. 36, 64; also iv. 28; also Targum Jonathan, Jer. xvi. 13, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, or in all the places cited in the list.

2 Sam. vii. 23. God is said to have redeemed Israel from Egypt, *from the nations and their gods.* See *Tremellius*, who translates it more to our purpose.

(q) p. 220. See the oration of Licinius to his soldiers.—Euseb. de vit. Const. l. 2, c. 5.

In the Syriac ξενον δαιμονιον אלהא נוכריא. The

altar of which St. Paul there speaks, in his defence, was inscribed, Θεῷ Αγνώστῳ καὶ Ξένῳ, which God, saith he, I preach unto you. Roma, cum pene omnibus dominaretur gentibus, omnium gentium serviebat erroribus; et magnam sibi videbatur assumpsisse religionem, quia nullam respuebat falsitatam.—*Leo. Magn.* in Ser. 1 in nat. Apost. Petri et Pauli.

Hic confutandi dæmonum cultus, hic omnium sacrificiorum impietas destruenda, ubi diligentissima superstitione habeatur collectum, quicquid usquam fuerat vanis erroribus institum. Id. ib.

(r) p. 221. See this use of ל Ezr. i. 5, Vulg. and Angl. *with;* Lev. xvi. 21, Vulg. *atque*, lxx. καὶ; Num. xxxiii. 2, lxx., καὶ; c. 32, 33, lxx. και, Vulg. *cum*, Angl. *with.*

[There seems no room to doubt the substantial correctness of Mede's construction. Three times the *Eloah* is mentioned as distinct from the *Mahuzzim*, and the description is amplified or varied each time; *with a God, even with a God whom his fathers knew not, with the foreign God whom he will acknowledge.* Yet although the Eloah takes precedence of the *Mahuzzim* in place and order, the honour and the costly offerings are ascribed only to the latter. The chief features of the whole description are three; first, marvellous things spoken against or concerning *the God of Gods;* second, a rejection of every former *Eloah*, or every subordinate Divine power owned by his fathers, and also of conjugal desire; and thirdly, the adoption of a new and foreign *Eloah*, with many *Mahuzzims*, and costly offerings to their shrines; or a complete system of one chief and many subordinate mediators, to replace those which had been renounced.]

(s) p. 231. Tertull. Apologet. l. 1, c. 24. Tot igitur sacrilegia Romanorum, quot tropæa; tot de Diis quot de gentibus triumphi, tot manubiæ, quot manent adhuc simulachra captorum Deorum.

[The description in Virgil of the battle of Actium

is another illustration of the Roman creed and practice, viii. 677—701.

Hic Augustus agens Italos in prælia Cæsar
Cum patribus, populoque, *Penatibus et Magnis Dis.*
. . . . . .
Omnigenumque Deum monstra, et latrator Anubis
Contra Neptunum et Venerem, contraque Minervam
Tela tenent. Sævit media in certamine Mavors,
Cælatus ferro, tristesque ex æthere Diræ.
. . . . . .
At Cæsar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho
Mœnia, *Dis Italis* votum immortale sacrabat
Maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem.

Here the Gods on each side are described as joining in the conflict, the Italian Gods triumphing, and those of Egypt and Asia overcome.]

(t) p. 247. [The force of the word *ἰδίαν* has scarcely been noticed by Mede, yet it adds greatly to the emphasis and clearness of the prediction. In the first place, it shews that the *ψευδολογοι* of the second verse are distinguished from the apostates in general, who are spoken of in the former clause. One are the followers, the others the leaders and instigators of the apostasy. The words, when paraphrased, have this meaning, that while the teachers of idolatry, by legends and other frauds, perverted the conscience, of others, and led them to suppose the worship of demons most acceptable to God, *their own* conscience became quite seared and hardened, till they could invent lies without compunction, and corrupt the doctrines of the faith by filthy and blasphemous tales, such as Mede has here quoted. When men are bent on promoting a system of delusion and superstition at all hazards, there is no foreseeing how long they may fall in direct fraud and blindness of heart. This is a seasonable truth at the present hour, when some are clearing the scum from such legends, and republishing what